00111687

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LXII.

Hagenbach's History of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland chiefly.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1879.

HISTORY

OF

THE REFORMATION

IN

ERMANY AND SWITZERLAND CHIEFLY.

BY

DR. K. R. HAGENBACH,

LATE PROFESSOR-IN-ORDINARY OF THEOLOGY AT BASEL.

111687
a c

Translated from the Fourth Revised Edition of the German

BY

EVELINA MOORE.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1879.

00111687

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS. CLARK have much pleasure in publishing the First Issue of the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY for 1879, viz.:—

HAGENBACH'S History of the Reformation. Vol. II. *Completion.*

PHILIPPI'S Commentary on the Romans. Vol. II. *Completion.*

The Second Issue for 1879 *will probably be—*

HAUPT ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

STEINMEYER ON THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD. New edition, prepared by the Author solely for the English translation.

The following Works are also in preparation :—

HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Translated from recent edition, and edited with large additions from various sources, by Rev. Prebendary

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.

CHAPTER XVII.

Death of Frederick the Wise—John the Stedfast—Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse—Diet of Speier, 1526—Francis Lambert of Avignon and the Disputation of Homburg—The Margrave of Brandenburg—Luther's Order of Divine Service—Way between the Emperor and the Pope—Otto von Pack and the League of Breslau—Church Visitation and Luther's Catechisms—Diet of Speier, 1529—The Protestation and its Consequences.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Further Course of the Swiss Reformation—Anabaptism—Zwingle's Treatise on Baptism—Infant Baptism and Anabaptism—Balthasar Hubmaier—Disputations at Hanz and Baden, 1526—Thomas Murner.

CHAPTER XIX.

Results of the Disputation of Baden—Retrograde Movements in Bern and Zurich—Calm Progress of Zwingle—Labours of Œcolampadius at Basel—Disturbances in that City—Disputation of Bern and Completion of Reform there—Reactionary Attempts—Proceedings of the Haslithalers—Further Progress of the Reformation—Ambrose Blarer and John Zwick at Constance—John von Reclining—The Reformation in Thurgau—Excesses in the Convent of Katharinenthal.

CHAPTER XX.

Victory of the Reformation in Basel—Order of Reform—The University—Simon Grynæus and Sebastian Münster—Death of Erasmus—Reformation in St. Gall and Schaffhausen—Hostile Attitude of the Romish and Evangelical Parties—Separate Alliances—First War of Cappel—Different Views of Luther and Zwingle concerning the Employment of Force—Zwingle's Hymn.

PAGE

CHAPTER XXI.

The Eucharistic Controversy resumed—Conference of Marburg and its Results—Francis Lambert—Philip of Hesse—Congress of Schmalkalden—The Schwabach-Torgau Articles—Convocation of the Diet of Augsburg—Luther at Coburg—Mercurino Gattinara, . . 95

CHAPTER XXII.

The Diet of Augsburg—The Confession of Augsburg—Confutation of the Confession—Apology for the Confession—Confession of the Four Cities—Zwingle's Communication to Charles V.—Eck's Revilings and Zwingle's Reply—Imperial Recess—Dissolution of the Diet, . 113

CHAPTER XXIII.

Import of the Confessions—General View of Protestant Doctrine; or, the Principles of Protestantism, ... 132

CHAPTER XXIV.

Supplemental Remarks—Martyrdom of Adolph Clarenbach and Peter Flysteedt at Cologne—Patrick Hamilton in Scotland—Louis Berquin in France—Diet of Westerås and Reformation in Sweden—Diet of Odensee and Reformation in Denmark—Landgrave Philip's Alliance with the Swiss—The Schmalkaldic League—Religious Peace of Nuremberg—Death of John the Steadfast—Religious War in Switzerland—Battle of Cappel and Death of Zwingle—Review of Zwingle's Character—Solothurn; Mayor Wenge—Death of Œcolampadius—Henry Bullinger and Oswald Myconius—First Confession of Basel, ... 161

CHAPTER XXV.

Romanic Switzerland—William Farel—The Reformation in Neuchatel and its Vicinity—Peter Viret—Beginnings of the Reformation in Vaud—Geneva and its Parties—Farel, Saunier, Froment, Olivetanus—Victory of the Reformation at Geneva, ... 186

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Prospective Council—Restoration of the Dukedom of Wurtemberg by the Peace of Cadan—The Reformation in Wurtemberg and its Effects upon Southern Germany—Augsburg, Frankfort-on-the-Main—Pomerania—Westphalia—Soest, Paderborn, Münster—The Anabaptists and their Kingdom, ... 206

CHAPTER XXVII.

Paul III. and his Legate Vergerio—Diet of Schmalkalden—Mediatory Efforts of Martin Bucer—Endeavours to procure a Union—First

Page

Helvetic Confession—Luther's Inclination for Peace—Concordia of Wittenberg—Schmalkaldic Articles—Truce of Frankfort—Death of George of Saxony—Introduction of the Reformation in Leipsic, Berlin, and Halle, ... 203

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Religious Conferences at Hagenau and Worms—Diet of Regensburg [Ratisbon]—Interim of Regensburg—The Bishopric of Naumburg—Henry of Brunswick—Further Spread of the Reformation—Hildesheim, Regensburg, etc.—Cologne and Münster—Diets of Speier and Worms—Protestant Diet at Frankfort-on-the-Main—Luther's Journey to Eisleben: his Sickness, Death, and Burial, . . . 210

CHAPTER XXIX.

Review of Luther's Character—Outbreak of the Schmalkaldic War—Diet of Regensburg—Preparations for War—Sebastian Schärtlin—Duke Maurice—Battle of Mühlberg—Captivity of the Elector of Saxony—Siege and Capture of Wittenberg—Bugenhagen—Fortunes of the Landgrave—Maurice at Wittenberg—The Pope and the Council, . . 258

CHAPTER XXX.

The Armed Diet of Augsburg—The Second Interim—John Agricola, John Brenz, and the Swabian Preachers—Pope Julius III. and the Synod of Trent—Maurice and the Third Interim (of Leipsic)—False Position of Melanchthon—Flacius and the Adiaphoristic Controversy—Another Diet at Augsburg—Siege of Magdeburg—Severer Treatment of the Landgrave—Intervention of Maurice—Treaty of Passau—Death of Maurice—Religious Peace of Augsburg—Death of Charles V., ... 277

CHAPTER XXXI.

John Calvin—His Youth—His Instruction in the Christian Religion—His First Labours at Geneva—His Banishment and Residence at Strassburg—His Marriage—Sadolet—Calvin recalled to Geneva, . . 301

CHAPTER XXXII.

Calvin's Second Appearance at Geneva—Ecclesiastical Discipline and Divine Worship—Ordinances—Controversy with Sebastian Castellio—The Libertines (Ameaux, Perrin, Ochet)—Controversy with Bolsec—Michael Servetus, his Trial and Execution—Reflections on the Employment of Capital Punishment against Heretics—Subsequent Conflicts of Calvin—Berthelier—Founding of the Academy—Calvin's Last Days—His Sickness, Death, and Burial, . . . 333

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Review of Calvin—The Church of Zurich and the Church of Geneva—

PAGE

Bullinger—The Consensus of Zurich—Westphal and Calvin—Last Days and Death of Melanchthon—The Reformation in France and the Netherlands, Hungary, Transylvania, Poland, Italy, and the Church in Geneva, Spain, England, . . . 345

CHAPTER XXXIV.

General Remarks—Influence of the Reformation over Politics, Science, Art, and Morals—Peculiar Thinkers in the Age of the Reformation—Schwenkfeld, Sebastian Franck, and others—Apostates: Thamer, Weigl, Spiess, ... 366

CHAPTER XXXV.

The Catholic Church in the Time of the Reformation—The Council of Trent—New Monastic Orders: Capuchins, Paulines (Barnabites), Theatines, Somaskers—Ignatius Loyola and the Jesuits—New Saints of the Catholic Church—Philip Neri—Peter of Alcantara—Saint Theresa—The Romish Inquisition—The Greek Church in the Age of the Reformation, ... 397

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.

CHAPTER XVII.

DEATH OF FREDERICK THE WISE—JOHN THE STEDFAST—PHILIP THE MAGNANIMOUS, LANDGRAVE OF HESSE—DIET OF SPEIER, 1526—FRANCIS LAMBERT OF AVIGNON AND THE DISPUTATION OF HOMBURG—THE MARGRAVE OF BRANDENBURG—LUTHER'S ORDER OF DIVINE SERVICE—WAR BETWEEN THE EMPEROR AND THE POPE—OTTO VON PACK AND THE LEAGUE OF BRESLAU—CHURCH VISITATION AND THE CATECHISMS—DIET OF SPEIER, 1529—THE PROTESTATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

ON the 5th of May 1525, previous therefore to Luther's marriage, the Elector Frederick the Wise departed this life, after having partaken of the Lord's Supper in both kinds. From his earliest years a pious son of the Church, within whose fold he was born and brought up, his familiarization with the ideas of the Reformation had been very gradual. He long maintained a waiting attitude in regard to the various innovations connected with that event—a circumstance which justly increases our admiration for the firmness which he continually displayed in defending the person of Luther against his persecutors, even at a time when he did not venture to express a decisive opinion in regard to the doctrines of that remarkable man. His whole manly character. By a careful perusal of the Pole-

Scriptures, he became more and more convinced that Luther stood upon the platform of the divine word. "To guard this word as the apple of his eye" was thenceforth his sincere endeavour. In a will drawn up in the very year in which Luther exposed his theses, he had made several bequests to ecclesiastical foundations and cloisters. These bequests he now retracted, having arrived at more enlightened views in regard to the institutions that they had been designed to benefit. The storms of the Peasant War drew sighs from him as he lay upon his sick-bed, and he recommended the use of clemency toward the misguided insurgents. Luther deeply felt the death of this man.[1] Frederick, having died without lawful issue, was succeeded by his brother John, afterwards called "the Stedfast."

Great changes had taken place before this time in the domain of politics. In February 1525, Charles V. had defeated his rival, Francis I. of France, at the battle of Pavia. The vanquished monarch was consequently obliged to relinquish his claims to Milan and follow the emperor to Madrid as a prisoner. Charles failed not to deal out menaces against all the German Estates that had been negligent in executing the provisions of the Edict of Worms. While at Toledo, he appointed a convention of the Diet at Augsburg in January 1526. This meeting, however, was productive of no special results, it being merely resolved that the Estates should reassemble at Speier in the following May, "when the cause of the holy faith, of peace, and of right should be treated of in a more stately manner." In the meantime, separate alliances were formed on both sides. The new Elector of Saxony found an important ally in the

[1] "O more amens," Luther writes to Spalatin (7th May 1525, De Wette, II. 598), "non tam morientibus, quam iis quos relinquunt mortui vivos." Comp. also Letters 608, 700, 701, 705. In the last-mentioned epistle (to John Rühel), 25th May, he connects various signs which had been observable in the heavens and on earth with the death of the godly prince: "The sign of his death was a rainbow which we, Philip and I, saw one night last winter above the Lochau; another token was a child that was born here at Wittenberg without a head, and still another was one born with twisted feet."

Landgrave of Hesse, Philip the Magnanimous.[1] Philip was the only son of the Landgrave William the Middle-Sized and the Duchess Anna of Mecklenburg. Losing his father at an early period of his life, he was declared of age in his fourteenth year (1518) by the old Emperor Maximilian I. Even previous to this time he had given proofs of his chivalric spirit in a struggle with Francis von Sickingen. In the year 1523 he married the daughter of Duke George of Saxony, the opponent of the Reformation. Notwithstanding this connection, however, he himself felt a drawing toward Luther and his cause. Since seeing and hearing the Reformer at Worms, and assuring him of his hope that God would help him if he was in the right, he had occupied himself much with the writings of Luther and with his translation of the Bible. The chivalric young ruler was particularly pleased with the character of Melanchthon, whose acquaintance he chanced to make in May 1524. As he was riding to the shooting gathering [*Gesellenschiessen*] at Heidelberg, he encountered, in the vicinity of Frankfort, a man whose whole appearance proclaimed him to be a votary of learning, and who was none other than Master Philip, at that time on a holiday journey to the Palatinate, his native country. Landgrave Philip engaged his learned namesake in a conversation of which the Reformation formed the theme, and sought to enlist Melanchthon's interest in the evangelization of his domains by requesting his opinion on the subject. A result of this interview was visible in the fact that the landgrave issued a mandate on the 18th of July in the same year (1524), commanding the preaching of the pure gospel throughout his territories. In the Peasant War, Philip entered into a close connection with the electoral house of Saxony. At Kreuzburg-on-the-Werra he expressed to John the Stedfast and his son John Frederick, the prince-

[1] ROMMEL, *Philipp der Grossmüthige, Landgraf von Hessen*, 3 vols., Giessen, 1830. See also the article by KLÜPFEL in Herzog's *Realenc.* xi. pp. 512 sqq.

elector, his determination to forfeit life, lands, and everything rather than give up the word of God. High as was the landgrave's estimation of Luther and Melanchthon, he also manifested a strong liking for Zwingle. And the Swiss Reformer, in return, placed great confidence in Philip, whom he regarded as a man of penetration, magnanimity, and constancy beyond his years.[1] On the 7th of November 1525, the two princes, John the Stedfast of Saxony and Philip the Magnanimous of Hesse, concluded the preliminaries to a close alliance at the hunting castle of Friedewalde in the Solinger Forest. In February of the succeeding year they again pledged themselves to support each other in case they should be attacked on account of their religion. This treaty was then ratified at an assembly at Torgau on the 4th of May. The offensive and defensive alliance thus formed received at Magdeburg, 12th June, the further accession of the Princes of Brunswick-Luneburg, Mecklenburg, Anhalt, and Mansfeld, and the city of Magdeburg. Thus equipped and joined together, the heads of this evangelical league, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, repaired to the Diet at Speier, which was opened on the 25th of June 1526. At this Diet Archduke Ferdinand caused a letter from his imperial brother, dated at Seville, to be read. In this communication, Charles complained anew of the free course which the Lutheran heresy was permitted to take in Germany, and emphatically demanded the execution of the Edict of Worms. Voices were heard proclaiming that the common people had already received too much instruction to surrender themselves any longer with simple faith to the leading of others. Utterances of this kind found a contrast in the episcopal recommendation that all books printed within the last eight years should be burned without further ceremony. At this imperial assembly, the Landgrave Philip distinguished himself above many others by his frankness of

[1] Zwingle calls him "juvenis, sed supra ætatem prudens, magnanimus, et constans."

speech. He showed (according to the testimony of Spalatin) that he was better read in the Scriptures than many a bishop. The evangelicals maintained a thoroughly dignified attitude throughout the session of the Diet. Their people refrained from all frivolities that might give offence to their adversaries. Divine service, accompanied with preaching, was daily held in their dwellings, at the entrances to which were displayed the escutcheons of the inmates, together with the Latin inscription, *Verbum Dei manet in æternum* ("The word of God endureth to eternity").

Various conciliatory measures were proposed at the Diet, such as the concession of the cup to the laity, the sanction of priestly marriages, the diminution of fasts and ceremonies, and the combination of a German service with the Latin ritual. No decision in regard to these matters was arrived at, however. And so, on the 27th of August, the following abstract of the resolutions of the Diet was published:—A legation shall be sent to the emperor, praying him to come himself to Germany and arrange the preliminaries for the convocation of a council; *in the meantime, let the conduct of every Estate toward its subjects, in matters pertaining to the Edict of Worms, be such as it shall be able to answer for to God and the emperor.* With the promulgation of this decree a decisive step was taken. It laid the foundation of the idea, which was afterwards put into practice, of letting the two religions spring up and develop side by side in the empire—the principle of parity.

Landgrave Philip of Hesse now proceeded without delay to the accomplishment of the Reformation in his own territories. In the execution of his purpose he availed himself of the assistance of a Frenchman, an exile from his native country in the cause of religion, who had received an impulse toward the Reformation from Switzerland, and had been in the service of the Landgrave since 1525.

Francis Lambert,[1] born at Avignon in 1487, was the scion

[1] Biographies of BAUM (Strassburg, 1840), HESSENKAMP (Elberfeld, 1860), and PRESSEL in Herzog's *Realenc.* viii. pp. 170 sqq.

of an ancient and noble family. Early deprived of his mother, he was brought up in a convent of the Minorites, and made the severest principles of that order his own. His sermons on repentance produced as powerful effects as had once followed those of Savonarola at Florence. Worldlings, converted by him and impressed by his cogent appeals, cast their pictures, their dice, and their cards into the flames. The order of the Minorites was not sufficiently strict for him, and he resolved to abandon it for that of the Carthusians. It was of just such strenuous characters that the Reformation had need. Never has its cause been served by volatile and libertine minds. Lambert's eyes were opened to the evangelical faith by the writings of Luther, and, this being the case, he was no longer willing to remain in a monastery. Being, in the spring of 1522, commissioned to travel on business of the convent, he embraced the opportunity to make his escape, and took refuge in Switzerland. At Bern, Berthold Haller, to whom he repaired, recommended him to apply to Zwingle at Zurich. He was still standing on the boundary line between the old and the new faith. At a disputation relative to the worship of saints, which took place prior to the decisive conferences of Zurich, he declared himself conquered. "I abandon," said he, "all rosaries and intercessors, and will henceforth hold, in all time of need, to God only and to Christ our Lord." Under the assumed name of John Serranus he proceeded to Basel, and fled across the boundary to Germany. In November 1522 he opposed, in a public disputation at Eisenach, the prohibition of priestly marriage and the practice of oral confession, and in 1523 made his appearance at Wittenberg. Luther at first received him with some distrust, but afterwards took a liking to him, and induced him to give exegetical lectures on the prophet Hosea; the Reformer also wrote an introduction to a publication of Lambert's.[1] The latter afterwards entered the service of Philip.

[1] *Commentarii in Minoritarum Regulam.*

Two months after the Diet of Speier, on the 21st of August 1526, a disputation was held at the castle of Homburg, by order of the Landgrave of Hesse, and presided over by Schrautenbach, the commissary of Government, and Chancellor Feige. Francis Lambert and Adam Kraft, the elder Reformer of Hesse, defended—the former in Latin and the latter in German—the doctrines advanced, in 158 theses, against Nicholas Ferber, Guardian of the Franciscan Order, and Master John Sperber, pastor of Waldau, near Kassel. Lambert was victorious in this discussion. His propositions relative to the constitution and discipline of the Church reposed upon the broadest democratic platform. Every individual church, he contended, should have the right to choose its own pastor, to whom episcopal authority should belong. Lambert recognised no episcopal authority *above* that of individual pastors, therein agreeing with the Church of apostolic times. He also maintained that a church should have the further right to depose its pastor in case of a non-performance of duty. There is, he asserts, a double calling—a calling to the state of a Christian, and a calling to the office and ministry of the Church. The former of these callings must precede the latter. Without the internal calling, the external calling is valueless. On these principles it was proposed to base the constitution of the Church in Hesse, and in these principles a rigorous church discipline was, of course, involved. A synod, composed of clergy and laity, should be convened annually for three days. Before this synod all complaints were to be presented, and were then to be investigated by a committee; church visitations were instituted, and to the visitors the right was accorded to depose all who should be found unworthy. "Whoso denieth the Lord Jesus Christ and His word" (thus ran the formula of prohibition), "let him be put away from our midst. But Christ's peace, mercy, and truth be with all who call upon Him. Amen." Luther was constrained to approve of this ecclesiastical constitution so far as its theory was concerned, but held that it did not admit of being

practically carried out, since there was not a sufficiency of men to uphold its provisions.[1] Lambert went farther than Luther in matters connected with divine worship as well as in things pertaining to church government. Images, organs, and bells were interdicted in Hesse as in Switzerland; the number of holy days was diminished; and for private confession, a general confession of sins by the congregation, previous to participation in the Lord's Supper, was substituted. In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Lambert still adhered to Luther; at a later period (after the discussion at Marburg) we shall see him adopt the views of Zwingle. One of the most precious fruits of the Hessian Reformation was the foundation of the University of Marburg on the 30th of May 1527. Lambert was appointed to a professorial chair in this institution, and proved to be a stimulating and beloved instructor, although, from the mere fact of his being a foreigner, he did not lack opponents who desired to preserve undisturbed the *German* character of the Reformation.[2] From Hesse the Reformation was introduced into the neighbouring provinces, the principalities of Lippe and Waldeck, the counties of Solms, Rietberg, Hersfeld, Fulda, and Fritzlar.

In consequence of the Diet of Speier, a third princely house of Germany, that of Franconia and Brandenburg, assumed a prominent position by the side of Electoral Saxony and Hesse in the Evangelical Alliance. Of the ten sons of Frederick the Elder, three here attract our notice — first, Casimir, who governed at Kulmbach and Baireuth; second, George the Pious, who ruled at Anspach; and third, Albert, since 1511 Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in Prussia. Margrave Casimir, the husband of a Bavarian princess, adhered to the Roman Catholic party, while Margrave George of Brandenburg decided in favour of the Reformation. Casimir held

[1] *The Hessian Ecclesiastical Constitution* has been recently republished by CREDNER at Giessen, 1852.

[2] Comp. ROMMEL, *l.c.* vol. iii.; SUDHOFF, article "Hessen," in Herzog's *Realenc.*

a Diet at Anspach in October 1526, at which, it is true, the general principle was laid down that ministers should preach nothing but the pure word of God. Notwithstanding this, however, the mass was to continue to be celebrated in Latin, the duty of fasting was to be enjoined upon the people, and innovations in general were to be kept at a distance. Casimir soon afterwards lost his life in an expedition against the Hungarians, when the government devolved upon the Margrave George, who, in the year 1528, established all things upon an evangelical footing. In regard to Margrave Albert, we have already stated that by Luther's advice he resigned his Grand-Mastership to the crown of Poland in 1525 (in accordance with the peace of Cracow), and turned Prussia into a dukedom. After this secularization of his domains, Albert, regarding himself as no longer bound by any religious vow, entered into the state of matrimony, and was united to the Danish Princess Dorothea, daughter of King Frederick I.

The work of the Reformation, meantime, became more and more firmly established in the Electorate of Saxony. On the twentieth Sunday after Trinity in 1525, the Lord's Supper was for the first time celebrated in the German language at Wittenberg. It cost some trouble, however, to carry out this innovation, especially in the country, the minds of the people having been intimidated by the Peasant War. Luther now brought forward in the Saxon lands his programme of a *German Order of Divine Service* (German mass[1]), which is well worthy of our closer consideration. "Above all things," Luther thus addresses his readers, "I most affectionately, and for God's sake, beseech all who see or desire to observe this, our Order of Divine Service, on no account to make it a compulsory law, or to ensnare or captivate the conscience

[1] The term "mass," which in reality is unexceptionable (being the old *Missa est*), was retained by Luther, while the Zwinglian Reformation abolished the name together with the thing. The Order of Divine Service may be found in *Luther's Werke* (WALCH, x.), and in MARHEINEKE, vol. ii. pp. 207 sqq.

of any thereby, but to use it, agreeably to Christian liberty and their good pleasure, as where, when, and as long as circumstances favour and demand it." So far was Luther from wishing to impose his practices upon others. He decidedly expressed himself to the effect that it was not his expectation that all Germany would adopt the system of Wittenberg. The idea of liturgical uniformity, to which so many, even in the Protestant Church, attach such value, was utterly foreign to his mind. "In fine, we institute this order not for the sake of those who are Christians already, for they have need of none of these things, nor do they live for them; but they live for the sake of those who are not yet Christians, that they may make them Christians; they have their divine service in their spirits. But it is necessary to have such an order for the sake of those who are to become Christians or are to grow stronger, just as a Christian has need of baptism, the word, and the sacrament, not as a Christian, for as such he has them already, but as a sinner. But above all, the order is for the simple and for the young folk, who must daily be exercised and educated in the Scripture and God's word, to the end that they may become conversant with Scripture and expert in its use, ready and skilful in giving an answer for their faith, and able in time to teach others and aid in the advancement of the kingdom of Christ. For the sake of such we must teach, preach, write, and devise; and if it could in any wise assist or promote their interests, I would have all the bells pealed and all the organs sounded, and let everything make a noise that could."

Luther laid down three different forms of divine service, of which the first is the *Latin* mass. It is a noteworthy fact that Luther did not desire the complete abolition of this. And why did he not desire it? Certainly not from any predilection for Rome, as the seat of the pope, but from love for the language of antiquity, and, indeed, for languages in general. We know how highly he esteemed the ancient languages, and how earnestly he recommended the study of

them. "I am," says he, "most deeply interested in our youth; and if the Greek and Hebrew tongues were as familiar to us as the Latin, and possessed as great store of fine music and song as that does, were I able to bring it about, mass should be celebrated, and there should be singing and reading in our churches on alternate Sundays in all four languages—German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. I am by no means of the mind of those who set all their love upon *one* language, despising every other; for I would gladly raise up a generation able to be of use to Christ in *foreign lands*" (a missionary idea here thrills through his breast), "and to converse with the people of such countries, so that we might not be like the Waldenses in Bohemia, whose faith is so involved in the toils of their own tongue that they can talk intelligibly and plainly with no one unless he first learn their language. It is not thus that the Holy Ghost proceeded in the beginning; He did not wait until the world should come to Jerusalem and learn Hebrew, but endowed the office of the ministry with all manner of tongues, so that the apostles could speak to the people wherever they went.[1] I should prefer to follow this example, and it is right also that the youth should be practised in many languages. Who knows how God will make use of them in years to come? It is for this end also that schools are established."

As the *second* form of divine service, Luther proposes the *German* mass, *i.e.* divine service in the German language, "for the sake of the simple laymen." This is the *public* service of God, or, to use a modern phrase, *the cult of the church of the masses.* In regard to this Luther had by no means very ideal conceptions. There are "many who attend upon the public worship of God who are not yet believers or Christians; the greater part stand and gape, that they may see something new; and it is just as though we celebrated the service of God on an open square or field amongst Turks or heathen" (a missionary sermon). To Luther, therefore, the

[1] An apprehension of the Pentecostal gift of tongues that could scarcely be justified from a historico-exegetical point of view.

public worship of the sanctuary was by no means that which it has been subsequently apprehended to be,—the expression of already existent Christian life,—but was primarily nothing but an *allurement* to faith and Christianity.

But, again, he treats of a "*third* method which the true type of evangelical order should embrace." This third form of divine service should not, he thinks, be celebrated "publicly among all the people;" but "those who are desirous of being Christians in earnest, and are ready to profess the gospel with hand and mouth, should register their names and assemble in some private house to pray, to read, to baptize, to receive the sacrament, and practise other Christian works. In this order, those whose conduct was not such as is befitting Christians, might be recognised, reproved, reformed, rejected, or excommunicated, in accordance with the rule laid down by Christ" (Matt. xviii. 15 sqq.). Have we, then, here the very idea of a little church within a church (*ecclesiola in ecclesia*), that was at a later period evoked by Spener, Zinzendorf, and the Methodists?—conventicles of the elect, *Brunnstuben* ["reservoirs (of piety)"], as Bengel called them? Most certainly. "*But*"—and note well this mighty "but,"—"But," adds Luther, with just tact and instinct, "I cannot and would not order or arrange such a congregation or assembly at present." And why not? "I have not the requisite persons for it, nor do I see many who are urgent for it." "But should it come to pass that I must do it,—that I am so pressed upon as to be unable with a good conscience to leave it undone,—then will I gladly do my part to secure it, and will assist it as best I can." "In the meantime, I would abide by the two aforesaid methods, and publicly among the people aid in the promotion of such divine service, besides preaching, as shall exercise the youth, and call and incite others to faith, until those Christians who are most thoroughly in earnest shall discover each other and cleave together, *to the end that there may be no faction-forming* (sectional partyism), such as might ensue if I were to take the management of the whole matter upon

myself; for we Germans are a savage, rude, tempestuous people, not lightly to be led into anything new, unless there be most urgent occasion." We see that this thorough German was not so prejudiced in his Germanity as to refrain from a plain statement of what he found amiss in his own people.

Meanwhile that which seemed to him of greatest importance was the development of the youth of Germany into a truly Christian people. "In the name of God, the first requisite in the German system of divine worship is a good, plain, simple, and substantial catechism. A catechism is a form of instruction, by which heathen, desirous of becoming Christians, are taught and shown what they are to believe, to do, to leave undone, and to know in Christianity; hence pupils who were admitted to such instruction, and were acquiring the rudiments of the Christian faith, were called catechumens previous to their reception of baptism." He then enters upon a somewhat ample dissertation as to the proper compilation of such a catechism. Not long afterwards (in 1529) he presented to the Church his large and small catechisms, which are justly regarded as model works of their kind. Without a solid catechetical foundation, all preaching seemed to him but labour lost. "Many a man listens to preaching for three or four years without learning enough from it to enable him to make answer, if questioned concerning a single article of the faith. Of the truth of this statement I have daily experience."

Yet in the worship of the sanctuary he undoubtedly regarded preaching as paramount to all else—as "*the greatest and most essential thing.*" We have already remarked that Zwingle departed from the time-honoured use of the pericopes, and connectedly explained whole books of Scripture; while in this, as in other points, Luther adhered to the ancient custom. We should, however, be mistaken were we to suppose that Luther regarded this system as the only correct one. He says: "The reason why we have retained the division of the Epistles and Gospels into portions corresponding with the different seasons of the [church] year, as has been the

custom hitherto, is, that we can see nothing especially censurable in such an arrangement." "In so doing, however, we have no thought of censuring those who take up the entire books of the Evangelists." Luther assigned the exposition of the Gospels to the week-day services, appointing Monday for the "one Evangelist," Matthew, and reserving Saturday afternoon at vespers for his favourite John.

"In regard to *Sunday*," he continues, "we sanction the retention of the chasuble, altar, and candles, until such time as they all shall change of themselves, or it shall please us to change them; but if any will do differently in these respects, we shall not hinder them." Luther, therefore, set no value on these externalities, he simply retained them for the time being. He, however, laid more stress upon the continuance of the custom of elevating the bread and wine at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and also retained the *Sanctus*, but ordered it to be sung in German, he having himself set it to music. The conclusion of the book is worthy of particular notice: "In fine, this and every other Order is so to be used as that, an abuse arising therefrom, it shall immediately be abolished and another made; just as the brazen serpent, which God Himself had commanded to be made, was broken in pieces and destroyed by King Hezekiah, because the children of Israel were misusing it. For ordinances are intended to serve for the furtherance of faith and love, and not for the detriment of faith. When they no longer perform that for which they are designed, they are dead and gone already, and are no more of any value; as when a good coin that has been counterfeited is, on account of its abuse, revoked and altered; or as when new shoes become old, or pinch, and are not worn any more, but are cast away, and others are purchased. Order is an outside thing; be it as good as it may, it is liable to be abused. In such case, however, it is no longer order, but disorder. Therefore no ordinance can stand or is binding of itself, or is deserving of such estimation as has been accorded to the papal ordinances hitherto; but the life, dignity, strength, and virtue of any

ordinance is the just use which is made of it, otherwise it is of no account at all."

During all this time fresh clouds were gathering on the political horizon. Pope Clement had espoused the cause of Francis I., and had released him from the oath which he had taken at Madrid. At the same time England united with France and the pope against Charles, in an alliance entitled the Holy League, and Charles found himself forced into a war with the pope, which, in a different form, and under different circumstances, renewed the old spectacle of hostilities between emperor and pontiff. The house of Colonna, from of old inimical to the Roman See, offered itself as an instrument of imperial vengeance. Supported by it, the imperial troops invaded Rome in the autumn of 1526, and plundered the Vatican, the Basilica of St. Peter, and the palaces of the Medici (the pontifical family). The pope himself was obliged to take refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, and was finally compelled to accede to a treaty with the Colonnas. In the spring of 1527, however, the war was renewed. The Constable of France, Charles de Bourbon, having fallen out with the court of France, fled to the imperial court, and there sought occupation as a warrior. He collected an army for the emperor, consisting of Spaniards and Italians, who were also joined by a force of 12,000 Germans, under the conduct of General George Frundsberg. On the 5th of May, Bourbon advanced upon the Holy City, which, by reason of the confidence that the pope reposed upon the peace concluded with the Colonnas, was bereft of all assistance. The city was taken by storm. Bourbon himself fell in the struggle. For nine days Rome was abandoned to the ruthless hands of the soldiery. During this time the finest works of art were destroyed. The pope, together with a portion of his court, found an asylum in the castle of St. Angelo, where for seven months he was held prisoner by the imperial troops. Under the windows of the fortress the German infantry shouted their huzzahs for Luther, and with soldierly rudeness derided the ceremonies of the Romish

Church. It was only upon hard conditions that the pope was finally released from his durance, and a peace concluded. Among the terms of this peace was included a demand for a council, to be convoked for the purpose of putting an end to religious errors. Simultaneously with these events, King Ferdinand, who had recently come into possession of the throne of Hungary and Bohemia, published a severe edict against every departure from the Romish faith and its usages. That, however, which more than these threats disquieted the minds of the Protestants and appeared to justify the taking of warlike measures, was the rumour of a "notable proceeding against the Lutherans." Otto von Pack, one of the councillors of Duke George of Saxony, confidentially communicated to Landgrave Philip of Hesse a terrible secret, relative to a plot formed at Breslau, by the adherents of the Papacy, on the 12th of May 1527. Ferdinand, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the Elector of Mentz and Brandenburg, the Archbishop of Salzburg, and the Bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg, Duke George of Saxony, and Dukes William and Lewis of Bavaria, had, it was declared, formed themselves into an alliance for the purpose of invading the Electorate of Saxony and compelling the surrender of Luther and all heretical preachers, priests, monks, and nuns, and the restoration of the ancient usages of the Church. Should these conditions not be complied with, King Ferdinand and the Elector of Mentz proposed to overrun the Saxon, Misnian, and Thuringian provinces, whilst Duke George would carry his arms into Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia, a similar procedure being in contemplation in regard to the city of Magdeburg. As a special favour, a more lenient treatment was in prospect for Landgrave Philip, in consideration of his being the son-in-law of Duke George; this clemency was to be accorded him, however, only upon condition of his return to the Catholic faith.

Of this treaty Pack produced only a copy, but promised to put the landgrave in possession of the original for the sum of 4000 florins. These disclosures, which Philip failed not to

communicate to his allies of the Electorate of Saxony, John and John Frederick, were received with the greatest consternation. Preparations for war were immediately made, and an estimate was taken of the forces which could be brought into the field. The landgrave transmitted the copy of the treaty to his father-in-law, assuring him of his regret at being obliged to take up arms against him, but stating at the same time his determination not to swerve one hand's-breadth from the faith, and declaring that not even the "friendship" (relationship) which existed between them could induce him to depart from this resolution. To his no small astonishment, however, the landgrave was informed that the whole story was purely an invention of Otto von Pack, who had hoped to realize a nice little sum by it. Sarcastic comments upon the credulity of the deceived princes were rife meantime. The matter was adjusted. The inventor of the fiction, who had not hesitated at other falsifications, was banished from the country. Luther, however, either could not or would not be convinced that there was not some truth in the story, though, faithful to his principles, he was adverse to all reprisals; "for," said he, "we should not paint the devil on the door or invite him to be godfather."[1] No greater disgrace, he declared, could befall the gospel than if the insurrection of the peasants should be succeeded by a similar procedure on the part of the princes—a thing that would be the ruin of Germany; nothing is gained by affronts and blows, for "'whoso taketh the sword shall perish by the sword.'"

Let us turn from this false rumour of war to the contemplation of a more peaceful work, which was effected in the year 1528—we refer to the *visitation of the churches of Saxony*.[2] Prior to this visitation, Melanchthon despatched papers of instructions to all the pastors of the electorate, together with an order of exercises for churches and schools, revised by Luther; he also furnished the visitors with

[1] Comp. *Luther's Briefe und Bedenken*, DE WETTE, iii. Nos. 984-988.
[2] Comp. the *Briefe*, *l.c.* Nos. 985-988, 1001-1014.

instructions.[1] Such pastors as were thoroughly incompetent were to be discharged, while the weak were to be borne with patiently. Experience showed that really good pastors were not to be found "as thick as grass," and it was the perception of this very fact that induced Luther to compile his catechisms. In the preface to his smaller catechism, he says: "I have been constrained and impelled to put this catechism or system of Christian doctrine into so minute, plain, and simple a form by the lamentable and wretched need for it with which I have recently become acquainted as a visitor of the churches. God help us! what mournful instances I have witnessed of that utter ignorance of the doctrines of Christianity which prevails among the common people, and especially among that portion of them who inhabit the villages. Many pastors also, alas! are utterly unfit and incompetent to teach. And yet they are all called Christians, they are baptized and attend upon the holy sacraments. They know neither Our Father, nor the Creed, nor the Ten Commandments, but live like cattle and irrational swine. Yet now that the gospel has come, they have learned excellently well to make a masterly abuse of Christian liberty. For God's sake, therefore, I beseech you all, my dear sirs and brethren who are pastors and preachers, to attend heartily upon your ministry and to have compassion upon your people who are commended to your charge, and to help us to acquaint the people, especially the young folk, with the catechism, to lay these tables and forms before you, and to instruct the people in them word by word," etc.

The smaller catechism was intended to be committed to memory by the youth, while the larger was designed as a manual for teachers. Both have not only been translated into almost all languages and passed through numerous revisions, but even to the present day they are not easily to be excelled in point of simplicity, earnestness, and popularity of style.

[1] The inspection of morals was committed to *superintendents*. This title, which was occasionally to be met with in the old Church, became the customary term in the Lutheran Church.

In these catechisms Luther adhered to the form, sanctioned by long usage, of taking as three main articles of his system of instruction, the Ten Commandments, the Apostle's Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. The first article, he affirmed, tells a Christian *what* he is to do and *what* he is to leave undone; the second directs him to the source whence the first derives its authority; and the third points him to the fountain whence he may obtain strength to fulfil the requisitions of the divine law. To these Luther added, as his fourth and fifth main articles, the institutions of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

What we have already said in regard to Luther's translation of the Bible will apply, on a diminished scale, to his catechisms. In the latter, as well as in the former, we behold a heart which not only beats for its people, and especially for the youth of the nation, but which has grown into union with the heart of the people and the youth, and therefore knows the exact tone in which they are to be addressed. Let us listen to his own words on the subject: "I am a doctor and preacher, and as learned and experienced as any of those persons who are so arrogant and self-confident.[1] I still do as a child to whom the catechism is being taught, and in the morning, and whenever I have time, read and repeat, word for word, Our Father, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Psalms, etc.; nor can I yet acquit myself as I would, but must remain a child and pupil of the catechism, which I also do gladly." His admirable interpretation of the language of Scripture, not in strained definitions of the schools, but in simple images drawn from ordinary life, may be illustrated by his explanation of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer: "When thou askest for daily bread, thou askest for everything that is requisite to enable thee to have and to enjoy thy daily bread, and petitionest for exemption from all that

[1] He refers here to those "slow bellies and self-confident saints," those "clowns and churls," some of them among the nobility, who maintained that there was no longer any necessity for pastors or preachers, declaring that people had their duty laid down in books and could learn it for themselves.

can hinder thee from having it. Thou must therefore open wide thy thoughts and send them abroad, not only into the oven or the flour barrel, but into the broad fields and the whole land, that beareth and bringeth to us daily bread and all manner of nourishment." And he also confessedly includes under this head of daily bread, not only "meat and drink, raiment, house, and shelter," but also "a healthy body, a good wife, good children and servants, faithful neighbours, kind friends," etc.[1]

The new Diet of Speier, convoked from Valladolid by the emperor on the 1st of August 1528, was now imminent. It was to have been opened on the 1st day of February 1529, but was delayed until the 15th March. Frederick, the count-palatine, represented the absent emperor. Count John Thomas de Pico de Mirandola appeared as the pope's legate. Eck and Faber were also present and exerted a powerful influence. The Catholic party had decidedly the ascendancy. Some princes who had hitherto been favourable to the Reformation were even induced to alter their opinions in regard to it. The sentiment of the majority was in favour of declaring the deliverance of the former Diet of 1526 invalid. It was resolved to send an address to the emperor, petitioning him to assemble a council. Meanwhile all further innovations in religious matters were to be prohibited. The minority were not allowed to be heard, but were required to submit themselves unconditionally to the majority. It was impossible, however, to comply with such a requisition. The Evangelicals openly declared that in matters which concerned the glory of God and eternal salvation, a settlement by the voice of the majority was improper and impracticable; every

[1] He also strove to preclude the possibility of false doctrinal conceptions, as is evidenced by his interpretation of the article in the Creed concerning the *resurrection of the flesh* [σαρκός, rendered in the English version of the Creed by *body*]. "This expression is not good German; for when we Germans hear the word *flesh*, our thoughts go no farther than the shambles. In good German we should say, 'The resurrection of the *body*, or corpse,' not in an *earthly*, but in a *glorified* body, that it may be like unto Christ's glorified body."

man must conscientiously answer for his own convictions. Failing to obtain a hearing, they drew up in the "Retscher Palace" a written *protestation*, and demanded that it should be appended to the decrees of the Diet. This protestation was signed by John, the Elector of Saxony; George, Margrave of Brandenburg; Dukes Ernest and Francis of Brunswick-Lüneburg; Landgrave Philip of Hesse; Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt; and the Chancellor of Lüneburg (Dr. Förster). It was likewise supported by the fourteen imperial cities of Strassburg, Nuremberg, Ulm, Costnitz, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Issny, St. Gall, Weissenborn, and Windsheim. From this protestation, framed on the 20th of April 1529, the Evangelicals received the name of *Protestants*[1]—a name which has since obtained a wider significance, and has frequently, indeed, been too broadly applied to all protesting. Duke Henry of Brunswick and Margrave Philip of Baden still endeavoured to effect an adjustment between the papal and evangelical parties, but, owing to the disaffected state of men's minds, met with no encouragement. An embassy, consisting of John Ehinger, burgomaster of Memmingen, Michael von Kaden, syndic of the city of Nuremberg, and Alexius Frauentraut, private secretary to Margrave George of Brandenburg, also met with a most ungracious reception from the emperor, whom the ambassadors encountered in September at Piacenza.[2]

The Evangelical states, thus thrown upon their own resources, beheld themselves compelled to take measures to defend their rights. A Diet was held at Rotach (in Coburg), at which the conclusion of an alliance was contemplated. The necessary document was drawn up, and nothing was wanting to its validity save the signatures of the assembled deputies, when a scruple was raised by the theologians of Wittenberg. The

[1] JUNG, *Geschichte des Reichstags zu Speier*, Strassburg and Leipsic, 1830; RANKE, *l.c.*

[2] Von Kaden fell sick at Genoa, but arrived later at his place of destination. The other two deputies were even treated as prisoners, and compelled to follow the emperor to Parma.

ground of their hesitancy was as follows. Strassburg and Ulm had fallen under suspicion in regard to the doctrine which they held concerning the Lord's Supper. Could there be any union with misbelievers for the purpose of defending the common faith? Against such a union Luther warned the assembly with the utmost earnestness. It might come to pass, he declared, as it is written in the seventh chapter of Joshua, that for the sake of the one Achan the whole people might be destroyed. The Elector of Saxony agreed perfectly with his theologians. The Landgrave of Hesse, on the contrary, regarded the scruple as sheer theological stubbornness; whilst Luther, in return, accused the landgrave of too great heat.[1] Thus, nothing was effected at Rotach, and the settlement of the matter under consideration was postponed to a future time. The landgrave, however, did all in his power to remove the obstacle which had presented itself. Should, he demanded, everything be made to depend upon the article of the Lord's Supper? Was no agreement in regard to it possible? Should not one more attempt be made to come to an understanding? What if the men, whose feuds had hitherto been conducted on paper, should be summoned to an oral disputation, at which they could look each other in the face and speak mouth to mouth? Such thoughts as these agitated the mind of Philip, and he determined to take issue on the matter in a public discussion, which he appointed to be held at his University of Marburg in October 1529.

But before betaking ourselves to Marburg as spectators of this discussion, it will be necessary for us to make another tour of inspection to Switzerland, and devote our attention for a time to the further course of the Reformation in that country. Afterwards we shall resume the thread of the sacramental controversy, which we let fall in the year 1526, and pursue it to the instant of the personal meeting in Marburg for an oral continuation of the conflict.

[1] Comp. the Letters, DE WETTE, vol. iii. Nos. 1105 and 1113.

CHAPTER XVIII.

FURTHER COURSE OF THE SWISS REFORMATION—ANABAPTISM—ZWINGLE'S TREATISE ON BAPTISM—INFANT BAPTISM AND ANABAPTISM — BALTHASAR HUBMAIER — DISPUTATIONS AT ILANZ AND BADEN, 1526—THOMAS MURNER.

WE have already devoted five chapters (x. to xiv.) to a consideration of the inception, and, in part, also the accomplishment, of the Reformation in Switzerland, having paid special regard to the execution of the work in Zurich. As in Wittenberg the quiet development of the Reformation, begun by Luther and Melanchthon, was disturbed by the proceedings of Karlstadt, Munzer, and the prophets of Zwickau, so the Swiss Reformation had sustained an admixture of heterogeneous elements which were connected in part with the Wittenberg disturbances and the leaders thereof. Thomas Munzer, after leaving Saxony, had repaired to Switzerland, and had even visited Œcolampadius at Basel and endeavoured to gain his favour, but his true nature speedily revealed itself.[1] From Basel he proceeded to Schaffhausen and Klettgau, and thence spread his net in the direction of Waldshut, where he found a congenial associate in Balthasar Hubmaier, and aided in revolutionizing the peasants of the Black Forest. Even prior to the appearance of Munzer, voices had been lifted up in Zurich and East Switzerland, clamouring for further progress, as is evident from the second disputation of Zurich (1523). The Zwickau prophets had already called infant

[1] While at Basel he succeeded in gaining over to his views Ulrich Hugwald, a man of learning,

baptism a " farce." Hitherto, however, a theoretical denial of the validity of the practice in question was all that had been attempted. Anabaptism, with all its social consequences, was actually set on foot for the first time in Switzerland. Here, Munzer's ideas fell on fertile soil. As leaders of the Swiss sect of the Anabaptists, the following men at once engage our attention:[1]—Lewis Hetzer, Conrad Grebel, and Felix Manz, in Zurich; Balthasar Hubmaier, preacher at Waldshut, and also for some time a resident of St. Gall; Laurence Hochreutener, Wolfgang Ullmann, John Brödtlein, George Blaurock, William Röublin, of whom we already know something, and many others. A few of these men—such, for instance, as Grebel—were not destitute of cultivation. This person was descended from a respectable family, and at first enjoyed the friendship of Zwingle and Vadianus, having even taken to wife a sister of the latter. The old historian Hottinger[2] describes him as " a learned but *melancholic* man." According to other accounts, Grebel was one of those persons who, possessing a good deal of talent, but little morality, are most comfortable when they can drown the reproaches of conscience in the tumult of passion, and forget themselves in the disorders to which they incite others. He seemed precisely calculated to be a misleader of the people, an agitator and instigator of riot in a time full of confusion. After trying in vain to persuade the judicious Zwingle to favour his plans, he came to a positive rupture with him and with Zurich. In company with Felix Manz, he ran, one day, through the streets of Zurich like a madman, crying woe to the city. Zwingle was declared to be the great dragon, the evangelical teachers were accused of being thieves and murderers, and an appeal was made to the voice

[1] Our chief sources of information here are BULLINGER, *Von der Wiedertäufer Ursprung, Secten, Wesen*, 1560; OTT, *Annales Anabaptistici*, 1671; GAST, *De Anabaptismi exordio, erroribus, historiis abominandis*, etc. Comp. several utterances of Zwingle in SCHULER AND SCHULTHESS' edition of his German writings, vol. i. Part ii., and HOTTINGER, *l.c.*

[2] *Helv. Kircheng.* vol. iii. p. 219.

of the people, through which, it was affirmed, the voice of God would speak.

These men commenced their disorderly proceedings at Zollikow, near Zurich. They began with a wanton destruction of images and altars (even a baptismal font was overturned and broken in pieces). Brödtlein, being deposed[1] on account of these extravagances, gave his adherents a farewell banquet, at which a large proportion of the guests, whose imaginations were heated by fanatical representations, demanded baptism; and they, after having received this sacrament, in their turn baptized others. In like manner, Manz and Grebel went about from house to house, dispensing with their own hands the Lord's Supper, or, as they said, "setting up the table of God." Nightly meetings were held, at which portions of the Bible were read and commented upon, and all sorts of prophecies were delivered. Similar occurrences took place at about the same time in Waldshut, where Balthasar Hubmaier, who assembled a strong party of adherents in that town, called his followers together on Easter eve of the year 1525, and, after having some water brought to him in a milk-pail, solemnly re-baptized three hundred persons.[2]

Such phenomena naturally excited much attention. That Catholic Governments, such as that of Austria, of which Waldshut was a dependency, took violent measures for their suppression, may readily be imagined. Nor could those Governments which had been favourable to the Reformation, as that of Zurich, for instance, be indifferent to such proceedings. It was by things like these that the very essence of the Reformation was itself imperilled, and a door thrown wide open to inrushing disorders. But before we examine into the measures that were taken against the Anabaptists in the different districts of Switzerland, we must enter upon a

[1] [He was pastor at Zollekow. See D'AUBIGNÉ'S *Hist. Ref.* vol. iii. p. 233.—TR.]

[2] Comp. SOHM, *Geschichte der Stadtpfarrei Waldshut, ein Merkwürdiger Beitrag zur Wiedertäufer geschichte*, Schaffhausen, 1820.

somewhat closer inspection of their doings, as they everywhere offered themselves to view.

Were we to judge the Anabaptists by their name alone, we should suppose their error to have consisted simply in their rejection of infant baptism, and their consequent re-administration of the baptismal sacrament to all who joined their communion. These practices, however, constituted but a portion of their error; had they been the only points in which they differed from the orthodox Reformers, the question might well have arisen whether some mutual understanding would not have been possible. Ay, if we would be honest and impartial, we must confess that doubt as to the expediency of infant baptism was not, in itself, such a horrible and unheard of thing;[1] for, the effort being once made to trace everything back to the Bible, and to allow nothing for which scriptural proof could not be adduced, the question must naturally arise as to whether the baptism of infants is commanded in the Bible. In regard to this query we can at least conceive of the occurrence of a theological and exegetical dispute similar to that which bore upon the institutive words of the Lord's Supper—a dispute which, however, would in no wise have necessitated all the extravagances of which the Anabaptists were guilty. We can imagine, on the contrary, that doubt as to the propriety of infant baptism might be entertained by perfectly clear-headed and sober-minded people, to whom it might seem more fitting that no one should be admitted to the sacrament of baptism until he should possess intelligence sufficient to have at least a faint perception of the divine mysteries, even though we can never actually comprehend them. Much at least might be adduced *in favour* of such a mode of procedure. It might be shown (and it *was* shown by the Anabaptists) that Jesus commissioned His disciples to *teach* the nations (literally, to disciple them) and to baptize them *after* they had been instructed. Christ says, further-

[1] PLANCK, in his *Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, vol. iii. pp. 45 sqq., judges very discreetly in this matter, as is his custom.

more, "He who *believeth* and is baptized," etc., thus making baptism dependent upon faith. Examples might be cited from the Bible to prove that in the ministry of the apostles instruction did in reality precede baptism; and the Anabaptists actually cited the case of the treasurer of Queen Candace, whom Philip baptized after he had instructed him. In addition to this might be adduced the history of the first centuries, in which the baptism of catechumens was really delayed until they had received regular and sufficient instruction. The testimony of noted fathers of the Church, that of Tertullian, for instance, might also be quoted as *adverse* to infant baptism.

It is true, on the other hand, that much might also be brought forward *in support* of the prevalent custom, much that really *was* urged by the Reformers. Although it might be impossible to *prove* that children were baptized in the apostolic age, it might be shown to be in some degree *probable* that such was the case, mention being frequently made of the baptizing of whole families, among the members of which it is fair to suppose that some children were comprised. Reference might be had (and this was, manifestly, *a more spiritual* demonstration) to the fact that it was concerning *children* that Christ said, "Let the *little ones* come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven." The last-mentioned circumstance was, indeed, not a logically exact proof; for where is it written that these children were *baptized?* Children might be brought to the Saviour by simply inducting them into the *doctrines* of Christianity, and baptizing them afterwards. A certain weight, however, still attached to the consideration that children, as well as grown people, have a place in the kingdom of God, that they have a share in its promises even before their understanding can grasp the significance of them. It was at least a beautiful and comfortable thought that the Church, like a careful mother, interests herself in the new-born mortal, anticipating his wants and providing for him even prior to the awakening of his own consciousness. In the *physical* life, the loving hands of others must care for us before we are able to

help ourselves. Why should not—why may not—there be a similar *spiritual* guardianship exercised over the young? And is it not the privilege of the baptized child of the Church, when he has arrived at years of discretion and received suitable instruction, freely and consciously to take upon himself the vows that others once made in his name? In the Old Testament (and this fact also was urged by the Reformers) children were received into the covenant of God by *circumcision;* why should not we be at liberty to let baptism take the place of circumcision as a covenant sign?[1]

Thus we see that the question of the propriety of infant baptism admitted of being discussed in a manner far removed from all fanaticism. There was surely, however, a fanatical obstinacy and exaggeration in the mere fact that, on account of a difference of opinion in regard to this matter, men would renounce all church fellowship with others, and in no wise suffer themselves to be prevailed upon to submit to a custom which at least is not condemned in the Bible, and which, when correctly apprehended and explained, contains nought of an anti-Christian nature. The main thing, after all, is not the letter of the institution, but the spirit and significance thereof. The circumstances of the Church had undergone an important change since the apostolic age. Becoming a Christian was then purely a matter of personal choice, there being as yet no publicly-recognised Church; and thus the reception of baptism could be left to the option of every individual. But since Christianity had become the Church of the people, since every person, simultaneously with his entrance into the world, was regarded as also a member of the Church,—an external member thereof, at the least,—things were different, and it was an evidence of a stubborn and intolerant spirit to refuse submission to this altered condition of affairs, even when the internal import of the matter in dispute suffered no detriment

[1] This does not make it necessary to regard circumcision as itself a sacrament or even as a distinct type of the sacrament of baptism. The reformed theologians went too far in this direction.

therefrom. Had, moreover, the Anabaptists confined themselves to a quiet and modest presentation of the grounds which they believed themselves able to bring forward against the use of infant baptism, some expedient could easily have been found, in the Reformed Church at least, which would have given satisfaction to both parties; for even then, the Government of Zurich, in compliance, most probably, with Zwingle's advice, left it to the option of all to defer the baptism of their children until they had attained their *eighth year*, not insisting obstinately upon the baptism of new-born infants.[1] (Luther, who was a more rigid stickler than Zwingle for the preservation of ancient usage in everything pertaining to the doctrine of the sacraments, would perhaps have been less inclined to such concessions.) The Anabaptists, however, were not satisfied with a presentation of their arguments; they proceeded to the adoption of active measures—they baptized for the second time those who had already been baptized, thus declaring that they regarded the baptism administered by the Church as spurious and false. In so doing, they attached themselves to the error of earlier sects (the Donatists and Novatians), that likewise re-baptized such as went over to them, and thereby defiantly dissolved all fellowship with the Church Catholic. It is in this respect that the principle of the Anabaptists is most distinctly contra-distinguished from that of the Reformers. The Reformers, also, regarded the Church in which they lived as corrupted, but not as fundamentally corrupt; it was their desire and endeavour to cleanse the Church from its abuses, and not to substitute a new Church for the old one. Nor did they wish, at the outset, to separate themselves from the Church as hitherto existent; it was not till that Church obstinately set its face against all attempts at reformation that they finally adandoned the great ship and took refuge in a boat. Even then, however, they recognised a certain bond of union between themselves and

[1] Hottinger, *Forts. von Joh. v. Müller*, vol. vii. p. 32 (after a mandate of 17th Jan. 1525).

the mother Church. Baptism, the symbol of fellowship, continued to be the same for both ecclesiastical parties, and to the present day is mutually respected. And in this conservation of a common symbol and a common historical basis with the old Church, there is much that we often too slightly consider. Not so the Anabaptists. For them, all things must become new. The Church, they declared, was neither here nor there. The visible must pass away. Not in temples, but everywhere, in the forest and on the mountains, God might be worshipped. The Anabaptists, furthermore, as true sectarians and separatists, despised not only the regular, systematic, and public worship of God, but also the office of the ministry and theological science; and whilst, on the one hand, they declared war on the letter, on the other hand they most absurdly adhered to it, burning bibles and books of devotion because of the declaration that the letter killeth. Thus they actually thought to expel the letter by the letter, as is invariably the case with fanatics, who cleave to the *dark* side of the letter and shut their eyes to its clear affirmations. Thus abandoning themselves, in their religious investigations, to an obscure, or rather to a heated imagination, nourished by the figurative passages of Holy Writ, and furthermore regarding their own dreams as revelations and inspirations of the Holy Spirit, they chanced upon the strangest tenets and vagaries. In political as well as in ecclesiastical concerns, they were regulated by no rules, and cherished the most indefinite and impracticable of aims. They held that no Christian should occupy the position of a magistrate. The magistratic office they regarded as a heathenish institution, a curtailer of Christian liberty; to take the oaths of fealty to the established powers was, according to their conception, equally wrong with any ordinary swearing. They were also opposed to military service and the bearing of arms; and even in social life, in the clothing which they wore and in their external behaviour, they presented a singular appearance. A community of goods was one of their favourite ideas, and one

which induced many from among the masses to espouse their cause. They also, in harmony with their spirituo-carnal sentiments, introduced the most mischievous disorders into the marriage relation. In point of fact, they were the authors of phenomena precisely similar to those which appeared among the enthusiasts of the first centuries, and which have arisen, under various modifications, extending down to the communion of the present day, in the ages since the Reformation. Let us illustrate some of their errors by the citation of a few facts.

One poor woman (it is related by a contemporary)[1] at the bidding of the angel Gabriel invited all her neighbours to a feast. The table being set and the company assembled at the appointed hour, the woman began to pray with all her might, and comforted the guests, who as yet saw no preparation for the meal, with the assurance that the angels would bring them food, as the Lord fed Israel of old with manna. But the company, after waiting with hungry maws until a late hour in the evening, separated undeceived and dissatisfied.

As this woman apprehended the promise of the Lord, "Ask and it shall be given unto you," in a literal sense, so by others the admonition *to become like little children* was likewise taken in a literal signification. Some of the Anabaptists might be seen in the street skipping and clapping their hands, while others would join in a dance, or, seating themselves on the ground, engage in some game, or roll and tumble with each other in the dust. Still others dandled dolls, or dragged fir cones, strung together on a thread, along the ground after them.[2] One Anabaptist sat for a long time on the bank of the Rhine, building little heaps of sand, and then, taking water from the stream in the hollow of his hand, let it trickle through the sand-heaps. When asked what he was doing, he replied that he was trying to obey his Saviour's command to become like a little child, since, manifestly, nothing could

[1] GAST, *l.c.* [2] HOTTINGER, *l.c.*

be more childish than this attempt to exhaust the river Rhine.[1]

Well would it have been, however, if the Anabaptists had been guilty of nothing worse than these ludicrous performances, melancholy though they were when considered in respect of their source. But religious delusion, which frequently mounted into convulsive frenzy (the so-called testifying and dying), took here and there a more dangerous turn. That many concealed the most sinful lusts of the flesh behind a super-spiritual mask, we have already stated. Yet even this was not all. A religious tendency that had taken leave of reason, and stifled every nobler human sentiment of admiration for the good and beautiful as a supposed remnant of the old Adam, led also to the commission of the most horrible murder.

In a lonely farm-house in the neighbourhood of St. Gall, where the number of the Anabaptists had increased to eight hundred, Hans Schucker, a man of eighty winters, dwelt with his numerous family. All were zealous sectarists; much folly had already been preached in their circle, and all manner of extravagances had been practised. On a certain day (8th February 1526), a younger brother, called Leonard, addressed Thomas, his senior, with the following words: "It is the will of the heavenly Father that thou shouldst strike my head off." In the presence of the brothers and sisters of the pair, Thomas besought God that he might receive a will for the work, but was not sensible of any answer to his prayer. The two then exclaimed, "Thy will, O Father, be done!" Leonard kneeled down, Thomas seized a sword, and in an instant the head of his murdered brother fell at his feet. After the commission of this deed, he took his lute and praised God for the success of the work. He then delivered himself up to justice, but obstinately persisted in affirming that not he, but the Father through him, had done the deed.[2]

[1] GAST, *l.c.*

[2] Comp. FRANZ, *Schwärmerische Scenen der St. Galler Wiedertäufer zu Anfang der Reformation*, Ebnat, 1824.

Various were the expedients resorted to against these fanatics. They were at first treated with clemency, and the effort was made to instruct them; but this mode of procedure having no effect upon their obdurate minds, violent measures were essayed. Zwingle and his associates not only defended the propriety of infant baptism in several writings, but public discussions of religion were instituted, in which the Anabaptists bore a part. The first of these discussions began at Zurich, 17th January 1525, and lasted for three days. Zwingle, Leo Juda, and Henry Grossmann replied with earnestness and dignity to the coarse or subtile questions of their opponents; but the latter were incorrigible. "They were," Bullinger says, "of a bitter and stony spirit, and would receive no instruction." Zwingle calls them "refractory blockheads" [*Letzköpfe*]. The consequence was that the civil authorities issued a mandate in favour of infant baptism, making banishment and heavy fines the penalty of non-compliance with the decree. On the 20th of March a second discussion, to which still greater publicity attached, was held in the great minster. As the Anabaptists still manifested no symptoms of yielding, recourse was had to harsher measures. "Since," says Bullinger, "kindness was of no avail with them, they were put into the high tower in the lower town, the one called the Witches' or New Tower. There were fourteen men and seven women of them. There they were fed on bread and water, to see whether it was possible to turn them from their error." The threat of drowning was even administered, in barbarous irony; for "he who dips," it was declared, "shall himself be dipped." The prisoners remained in durance until the middle of Lent (8th April), when they succeeded in making their escape, aided, as they reported, by an angel. The greater part of them repaired to the province of Grüningen. Grebel fled to Schaffhausen, where he joined his friend Sebastian Hofmeister, whom he vainly hoped to win over to the cause of his sect.

Grebel found a more favourable soil for his principles at

St. Gall, where Anabaptism had already taken deep root. On Palm Sunday (9th April) a whole troop of the people of St. Gall, with Grebel at their head, proceeded to the Sitter for the purpose of receiving baptism.

In Basel also, Œcolampadius instituted various discussions with the Anabaptists. He having first endeavoured, at his residence,[1] in August 1525, to disabuse them of their errors, religious discussions were held two years afterwards in St. Martin's Church, and, after the lapse of two years more, in the town hall; similar steps were taken in the surrounding country, but without avail. And yet Œcolampadius spared no pains in the endeavour to convince the misguided people of their error; he patiently condescended to the weak apprehension of the majority, sustained the rudest insults with invincible forbearance, and exposed his own person to mortal peril. Even persons whom he thought he had reformed, and in whose behalf he had besought the indulgence of the Government, turned against him after they had been released from punishment, and caused him to feel their hatred. In a word, the fanatical *furor* appeared to be incurable; it must needs, like a fever, run its time before it could abate. This time, however, was not accorded it; it was resolved that caustic remedies should extirpate the evil which refused to yield to the word of instruction. At Zurich, November 1525, a third disputation was called, and assembled at first in the town hall, and afterwards—that building not affording a sufficiency of room—in the church. Like the other discussions, it ended fruitlessly. Grebel, Manz, Blaurock, and others of their faith were again summoned before the council, and admonished to return from the errors of their ways. All measures proving unavailing, the authorities lost all patience, and the oft-threatened penalties were put into execution. Felix Manz was drowned. He died with composure, uttering the words, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit!" whereat

[1] Not at first, as is usually stated, in St. Martin's Church. See HERZOG, *Œcolampad.*

many were indignant.[1] Blaurock was beaten with rods, and, on being banished from the city, shook "his blue frock [*blauen Rock*] and his shoes against the town of Zurich."[2] He escaped to the Tyrol, where he ended his days on the scaffold. Most of the remaining Anabaptists met with a similar fate. Krüsi of Appenzell was apprehended in Schwytz, taken to Lucerne, and condemned to the flames.

There is one man who, rising as he does from the great mass of the Anabaptists as a more noble personality, deserves that we should devote some attention to him, and to the discussions which arose between him and Zwingle on the subject of baptism in general, and infant baptism in particular—we refer to Balthasar Hubmaier,[3] whom we have already cursorily mentioned.

Hubmaier was born about the year 1480, at Friedberg, near Augsburg, and, from his birthplace, occasionally appears under the name of Friedberger (Pacimontanus). He studied at Ingolstadt, and was at first an enthusiastic pupil of Eck, whom he extolled in a poem. He then received an appointment at the cathedral of Regensburg. Here he manifested his zeal by persecuting the Jews. He prevailed upon the magistrate of Regensburg to banish them from the city. Upon the site of their synagogue a chapel was erected in honour of "Mary the Fair," and to this place numerous pilgrimages were performed; it even became the scene of wondrous cures and pious frenzies. Hitherto Hubmaier had been a decided, nay, more, a fanatical Catholic. At this time, however, after perusing the writings of the Reformers, he became an equally decided, and soon a fanatical Protestant. He was compelled to leave Regensburg on account of the freedom with

[1] See BULLINGER, vol. i. pp. 294 sqq. and 381 sqq.: *ist stijff uf sinem Kyb beharret bis an sin End.*

[2] BULLINGER, p. 382.

[3] He is also called Hübmör and Hübmaier. Comp. H. SCHREIBER, *Balthasar Hubmaier, Stifter der Wiedertäufer, auf dem Schwarzwald*, in the *Hist. Taschenbuch für Süddeutschland*, 1839-40; and CUNITZ in Herzog's *Realenc.* vol. vi. pp. 298 sqq.

which he expressed his sentiments. At an earlier period he had earned his bread as a teacher at Schaffhausen, and thither it was that he now again resorted in the same capacity, remaining there until called, about 1522, to the pastorate of Waldshut. Here he made the acquaintance of Zwingle, and was at first an evangelical preacher. In the year 1523, while on a journey, he preached at St. Gall to a large concourse of people. How much influence Münzer may have had upon him it is difficult to determine. Bullinger assumes that he *was* influenced by him to some extent. He describes Friedberg as an eloquent and well-read man, but says that he had "an inconstant mind that swayed him hither and thither."[1] He also states that after the commencement of Hubmaier's intercourse with Münzer, "who prated much about the redemption of Israel," he became entirely changed. In the beginning of the year 1525, Hubmaier appeared as an opponent of infant baptism. He first broached his scruples relative to the subject to Œcolampadius, who vainly strove, in a written refutation of his arguments, to disabuse him of his errors. The passage, "Suffer little children to come unto me," cited (though very precariously) in favour of infant baptism, Hubmaier explained as signifying that children should certainly be presented to the Lord; not, however, by baptizing them, but by pronouncing the blessing of the Church upon them and praying over them. Such was his own mode of procedure at Waldshut. It was only when parents were urgent in demanding that their children should be baptized that he complied with the traditional usage. In May 1525, Zwingle published his important work, "On Baptism, Anabaptism, and Infant Baptism" [*Von dem Touff, dem Widertouff, und dem Kindertouff*].[2] In this he proceeded from the premise that nothing whatever of an external and elementary nature is able to purify the soul; the grace of God alone is sufficient

[1] Vadianus also describes him as *eloquentissimum sane et humanissimum virum*, but accuses him of a rage for innovation.

[2] *Werke*, vol. ii. pp. 230 sqq.

for that. Baptism, consequently, cannot wash away sin. It is merely a "*sign of allegiance*" *on the part of God's people*, similar to the covenant sign of circumcision in the case of the people of Israel. Resistance to infant baptism consequently seemed to him to be resistance to the ordinances of God.

Hubmaier replied to this treatise of Zwingle's by another treatise.[1] Baptism was to him something more than a simple sign of allegiance. Christian baptism appeared to him to be contra-distinguished from the baptism of John by the fact that it was not, like the latter, a baptism unto repentance, but a baptism unto the forgiveness of sins. He therefore, like Luther, beheld in baptism an act whereby an actual boon of salvation is communicated to the person baptized. He differed from Luther, however, in denying that such a boon is communicated to unconscious children, who have no understanding of the matter, and from whom no faith is to be expected. "If it be said," he continued, "that baptism presupposes the *future* faith of the children baptized, the administration of the sacrament on such an assumption is like hanging out a [cask] hoop (a public-house sign)[2] at Easter, in anticipation of the wine that will not be barrelled until the next autumn, and of which no one knows whether it will not be destroyed beforehand by hail, frost, or some other calamity." To baptize unreasoning children seemed to him not a whit better than baptizing dogs and monkeys. Should it be alleged, however, that infant baptism is nowhere *forbidden* in the Holy Scriptures (even though it be not expressly *commanded*), then the reading of mass and a thousand other abuses that are also not expressly forbidden might be allowed with equal propriety.

Zwingle, who, though nowhere directly mentioned in Balthasar's production, was nevertheless covertly attacked,[3] failed

[1] *Von dem christlichen Touff der Gläubigen.*

[2] [In Germany a hoop is frequently suspended at the entrance of taverns, as an indication of the cheer that is to be found within.— Tr.]

[3] Balthasar, for instance, had spoken of *Zünglern* [*babblers*, literally *tonguers*], in allusion to Zwingle's name.

not to indite a reply. In answer,[1] he accused his opponent of confounding water baptism with the baptism of the Spirit, thus relapsing into the Popish creed. He continued to maintain that water baptism is an external thing, a covenant sign, and nothing more. That, furthermore, infant baptism was not a Papal institution, as the Anabaptists affirmed, but that Origen designates it as of apostolic transmission, was, together with other items, demonstrated with historic solidity.

The disputants were by no means lacking in passionateness of tone. While Hubmaier called the vindicators of infant baptism "baby-washers," Zwingle termed the adherents of Hubmaier "journeymen bathers." But the worst feature of the controversy was that Hubmaier's conduct therein deprived Waldshut of the blessing of the Reformation. The town was in danger of falling into the hands of Austria. The Evangelical states, which might have protected it, abandoned it to its fate, because it would not give up its preacher, whose banishment from Waldshut had been required. The town was therefore obliged to surrender at discretion, on the 6th of December 1525. Hubmaier took refuge at Zurich, in the house of a widow who was an adherent of his sect. The council of the city, however, drew him forth from his concealment and cast him into prison. An oral disputation ensued between him and Zwingle, and he finally made a public recantation on the 6th of April 1526. His further fortunes and his end are lamentable. An unsettled and fugitive wanderer, he visited Bavaria, Austria, and Moravia. At Nikolsburg he gathered an Anabaptist congregation around him; he was also constantly active as a writer. When, however, on the death of Lewis of Hungary, the province of Moravia fell to King Ferdinand, religious tolerance was at an end. Hubmaier was taken prisoner in 1527, together with his wife, who had accompanied him in his wanderings, and conducted to Vienna, near to which city, in the castle of

[1] *Ueber Dr. Balthasar's Taufbüchlin, Zwingli's Werke*, vol. ii. chap. i. pp. 337 sqq.

Greifenstein, he awaited his further destiny. He was condemned to death as an instigator of disturbances at Waldshut, and among the peasants, and on the 10th of March 1528 ended his days at the stake with the constancy of a martyr. Three days later his faithful wife was drowned in the Danube.

In 1527 the Swiss states of Zurich, Bern, and St. Gall published a decree against the Anabaptists, threatening them with the severest corporal and capital punishments. In view of such edicts, it is with double pleasure that we recall the words of Luther, who said that "heresy (sectarianism, etc.) can neither be cut in pieces by the sword, nor consumed in the flames, nor drowned in the floods," but that the word of truth alone must be confided in for its destruction. In apology for the harsh measures of the Swiss governments, it may be stated only that the outbreaks of religious enthusiasm frequently led to crimes, instances of which we have given, and that everything that menaced the Church was regarded and condemned as perilous also to the State.

Let us now return to the progress of the Reformation in Switzerland.

In the beginning of the year 1526, the two religious parties in the Grisons measured their strength against each other at the disputation of Ilanz, on the festival of the Three Kings (6th January [Epiphany]). The adherents of the old faith, the Abbot of St. Lucien, Theodore Schlegel, and three deans, together with a few capitulars and monks, had accused the Reformer Comander and his adherents before the governors of the Grisons. The latter instituted a religious conference. Two men were appointed from each of the three leagues, to whom the conduct of the disputation was entrusted. A number of theses against oral confession, the prohibition of meats, the abuse of spiritual authority, against images and the mass, and also against the apprehension of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Lutheran sense, formed the starting-point of the discussion.[1]

The course of this disputation is described with great *naïveté*

[1] See BULLINGER, vol. i. p. 315.

by Bullinger. The Episcopal vicar of Chur and the Abbot of St. Lucien exerted themselves for its frustration, entrenching themselves behind the dietetic question, amongst other points. To their arguments relative to the above-mentioned subject, a poor parson (the pastor of Brätz) replied that the bishop and his vicar had no need to complain on the score of victuals; "Let us poor under-shepherds complain," he said. Master Thommeli, the pastor of Dünzen, thought that the Greek language was a public calamity; had not the Hebrew and Greek come into the land, so many disturbances and heresies would never have arisen. It was at first decided to admit no strangers as guests at the disputation. It was only after some lengthy discussions that access was granted them, and then they were obliged to be silent. The admitted guests were Sebastian Hofmeister of Schaffhausen, who afterwards published an account of the proceedings of the conference,[1] and Jacob Ammann of Zurich. Amongst other things the passage, "Thou art the rock" [σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, etc., Matt. xvi. 18], was discussed. This rock on which the Church is said to rest, was by some thought to be Peter, and by others to be Christ. The governors of the Grisons soon became weary of the theological wrangling, and, in the afternoon session, urged for a termination of the dispute: "For half a day they (the disputants) had had each other by the ears about one solitary article; henceforth they should be more discreet and skilful, or the governors of the leagues would leave their seats and no longer listen." Notwithstanding this protest the conference was continued; indeed, purgatory and the sacraments were discussed with more vigour than ever. The Abbot of St. Lucien defended the doctrine of purgatory, on the ground that there must be degrees of blessedness, for Christ spoke of many mansions (John xiv.). He discoursed so long on the sacrament that the opposite party had no opportunity to speak, and nothing remained for Comander but to enter a protest previous to the dissolution of the session. On the other hand,

[1] HALLER, *Schweizerbibl.* vol. iii. p. 212.

he continued to preach the gospel in Chur with all earnestness, and in this way caused the mass to be abolished and the gospel to prevail in most of the Grisons towns. Immediately after the disputation seven priests renounced the mass; and one and another of those who were present at Ilanz may have carried home with them into their remote pastoral hamlets good seed, which was afterwards to spring up and bear fruit.

Of greater importance for the fortunes of the Reformation in Switzerland was the religious conference which took place in the town of Baden, in what is now the canton of Aargau. The county of Baden and the free bailiwicks were then under the common jurisdiction of the cantons of Zurich, Lucerne, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, and Glarus. Dr. Eck, the "land disputant" (as Bullinger calls him), had long been considering how he might repair the notch which had been made in his sword in the tournament at Leipsic. In the year 1524 he despatched a letter to the confederates, proposing that he should dispute with Zwingle. This proposal led, first, to a written controversy between Zwingle and Eck. Zwingle accused his antagonist of atheism; for he who does not believe God's word denies His essence, he declared. He compared him to a bad physician, who tries to heal wounds in the head by applying a plaster to the knee, etc. Zwingle himself, however, grew weary of this species of polemical discussion, and desisted therefrom. The mutual abuse and recrimination of the two parties led to nothing good, he affirmed, and were no better than the bickerings of a couple of angry women. And, indeed, there was no lack of quarrelsome individuals. Besides Eck and Faber, a third combatant appears in the camp of the opponents of the Reformation —one who played but a subordinate part at the Baden disputation itself, but whose sentiments were afterwards displayed more boldly in opprobrious tractates, similar to some which he had formerly directed against Luther—we refer to Murner, a Franciscan monk. He was born at Strassburg

(14th December 1475), and distinguished himself at various Universities,—at Freiburg in Breisgau, at Cracow, at Basel, and in Strassburg itself, as a man of sprightly intellect and satirical power. Previous to the Reformation (in 1512) he delivered at Frankfort-on-the-Main a series of sermons, modelled upon those of Geiler of Kaisersberg. The *Narrenbeschwörung* and the *Schelmenzunft* were the issue of these sermons. At this time Murner stood on the side of those who censured the weaknesses and defects of the clerical body. In his *Gouchmatt* (Basel, 1519) he depicted the luxurious and effeminate behaviour of the men of his time. He was no friend to the Reformation of Luther, although he admitted the justice of individual features of it, and we find him only too soon on the side of Eck, Emser, and Cochlæus. He wrote several opprobrious tractates against Luther; amongst them the satirical poem, *Vom grossen lutherischen Narren*, was especially remarkable for its coarseness.[1] At the time of the disputation of Baden, Murner was a lecturer and professor of theology at Lucerne. From the pulpit he inveighed against Zwingle, announcing to the people his intention of putting him to confusion at the conference at Baden.[2] To Eck's theses, which we are just about to consider, he added two—one in favour of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the other in opposition to the secularization of the property of the Church. Neither of them, however, was discussed.

The theses of Eck, which were to form the basis of the disputation, were as follows:—1. The true body and blood of Christ are present in the sacrament of the altar; 2. They are veritably offered, in the service of the mass, for the living and the dead; 3. Mary and the saints are to be invoked as intercessors; 4. The images of the Lord Jesus and of the saints should not be abolished; 5. There is a

[1] A new edition of this was published by Henry Kurtz, at Zurich, 1848. His coarseness brought him the ambiguous fame of a *Lutherygeissel* (*Lutheromastix*).

[2] *Epp. Zwinglii*, vol. i. p. 284.

purgatory after this life; 6. The children of Christians are born in original sin; 7. The baptism of Christ, and not that of John, removes original sin. (It was not necessary to discuss the last two theses, as they were received by both sides.)

Zwingle replied to the proclamation of the twelve cantons[1] [convoking a conference at Baden] by a warning against the writings of Eck and Faber, and a petition that he might be allowed to designate some other place than Baden as the field of combat. This request not being acceded to, he declined to assist in person at the conference — a refusal which was not only (though with injustice) attributed to cowardice by his opponents,[2] but was also censured by his friends.[3] Œcolampadius, who had complied with the summons to the disputation, and upon whom the brunt of the battle now descended, felt himself particularly forsaken, with no Zwingle to render him aid.[4] All the more powerful, however, was the impression which the modest theologian of Basel made upon those who were present. It is thus that Manuel of Bern speaks of him in his poem on the disputation :—

"Gsell, ich gäb' ein Guldin drum,
Ach, dass du Œkolampadium
Zu Baden hättest gesehen,
Mit so grosser Demüthigkeit,
Ein Mensch, der gar kein Gallen treyt (trägt),
Das müssen's selbst verjähen (bekennen).
Sein Schlussred, die er hat g'lehrt,
Die hat er ehrlich erhalten."

Besides Œcolampadius, who was accompanied by his colleagues at Basel, Jacob Immeli, preacher at St. Ulric's, and Weissenburger, chaplain of the hospital, there appeared

[1] BULLINGER, p. 337, and *Zwingli's Werke*, vol. ii. 2, pp. 424 sqq.

[2] He had, they declared, "by his superfluity of writings and his printed books," been the chief cause of the excitement, and now he desired to remain in the background.

[3] By Œcolampadius particularly. See MÖRIKOFER, vol. ii. p. 34.

[4] Vadianus openly expressed his commiseration of the champion of Basel (MÖRIKOFER, *ibid.*).

on the reformed side, Berthold Haller of Bern, and Ludwig Œchsli of Schaffhausen. There were present also several other scholars of Switzerland and from abroad. Erasmus, to whom an invitation had been sent, and who was at that time residing at Basel in the house of Frobenius, politely excused himself on the plea of ill-health. The disputation took place in church. Every morning at five o'clock a solemn service was held, succeeded by a sermon half an hour in length. A similar practice obtained, as we have seen, at the disputation of Leipsic. The matter was religiously conducted by both parties; they were unwilling to engage in so decisive a work without first beseeching God for His blessing. The clergy, among whom there were many from whose shoulders costly draperies flowed, marched in solemn procession to the Church. The discussion began on the 21st of May, and lasted for eighteen days. Each party was permitted to choose two clerks; and over each clerk an inspector was appointed, who controlled the protocol. All others were forbidden, on pain of death, to write down anything that was said. Notwithstanding this prohibition, Thomas von Hofen, a citizen of Bern, secretly took notes which were afterwards printed at Strassburg. It is also narrated of a young man from Valais (Thomas Plater, incontestably) that immediately after the sessions he proceeded to the baths, and there wrote down from memory all that had occurred. It was this same Plater who, in the disguise of a vendor of chickens, discharged the office of messenger between Œcolampadius and Zwingle. On more than one occasion he knocked up the latter in the night, in order that he might give him the news.

The disputation was presided over by Abbot Barnabas of Engelberg, Knight Jacob Stapfer, Magistrate Hans Honegger of Bremgarten, and Dr. Ludwig Beer of Basel, an adherent of the Catholic doctrine, but a man of great moderation and a friend of Erasmus. According to the testimony of contemporaries, Dr. Beer was also the only member of the

Catholic party who retained his dignity and composure, and did not suffer himself to be carried away by passion.[1]

Œcolampadius, who, as we are aware from his previous history, had no fondness for disputations, here developed rare talent. He was the principal opponent of Dr. Eck, of disputatious fame, in discussing the doctrines of the Lord's Supper, the invocation of saints, purgatory, and the use of images. Eck occupied a magnificently-appointed pulpit, while his adversary had to content himself with a simple desk. The latter, however, impressed all his hearers by his intellect, so that one of the adherents of the papistical party could not refrain from exclaiming, "Would that the long yellow man were on our side!" Œcolampadius likewise gained the respect of all who observed him off the arena of disputation. Whilst the combatants of the papistical party enjoyed themselves in carousals, for which the Abbot of Wittengen was obliged to furnish the wine (Eck was said to *bathe* in wine instead of water at Baden),[2] Œcolampadius quietly withdrew to his chamber, where he passed his time in study and prayer. So discreet was his behaviour, that the landlord of the *Hecht* inn, with whom he was lodging, and who regarded him as a heretic, declared that he must at all events be a pious man. Of the discussion itself we will present one characteristic feature.[3] Œcolampadius made use of a singular illustration to demonstrate the inadmissibility of the worship of the saints. If, said he, a man were to ask me the way from Baden to Basel, I should not direct him to go through Bern and Solothurn, but would point out to him the direct way. In the same manner, when we wish to go to God, we ought not to make the circuit of all the saints. Eck, how-

[1] Bullinger complains of the partiality of the presidents. He says that when an oath, such as *Botz Marter*, occasionally escaped Eck, the presidents let it pass; when, however, the disputants on the other side essayed to talk more freely, the presidents "reprimanded them immediately [*so was man ihnen uf der Huben*] and commanded them to behave discreetly."

[2] FRANZ, in his *Leben Thomas Platers*, after Bullinger.

[3] See HOTTINGER, *Forts. von Joh. v. Müller*, vol. vii: pp. 92 sqq. On the further course of the discussion, see HERZOG'S *Œkolampad.* vol. ii.

ever, skilfully turned this illustration to his own advantage. Certainly, said he, if a man wished to go from here to Basel, I should not send him through Bern and Solothurn; but I *must* direct him to Brugg and Rheinfelden, nor can he avoid those places if he would take the shortest road. Thus the Catholic Church did actually regard the saints as *mediate* personages, not as remote and collateral characters; and Œcolampadius was himself constrained to admit that he had made choice of a bad illustration. This incident will, however, show the snares in which men become entangled when they attempt to treat subjects of a metaphysical and supersensuous nature in too popular a style. Such discussion offers a boundless field for the display of wit—wit of a species in which the Protestants, unskilled in subterfuge, were frequently overpowered by the wily and dexterous Catholics, for the reason that the latter did not enter into any subject, and couched all their arguments in an *ad hominem* form. When, on the other hand, the Reformers planted their feet on the platform of *Scripture* and refused to be driven thence, they were sure of victory, even though their adversaries might not acknowledge it to be theirs. Hence Œcolampadius was right in speedily quitting the slippery ground of witty similitudes and withdrawing from the disputation with the simple declaration: "*I commend the matter to the Scriptures.*" And it was from the approval of the Scriptures that himself and his friends had need to derive consolation in view of the issue of the debate. After Thomas Murner had, as a parting satisfaction, vented his spleen against the absent Zwingle in a violent oration,[1] the discussion was declared to be ended, and all present were commanded to indicate in writing the party to which they intended henceforth to adhere. The majority (for many of

[1] He called him a tyrant, and styled his adherents infamous liars and perjurers, criminal, faithless, disgraceful persons, thieves, church robbers, gallows birds, and declared that every honest man would blush to associate with them, etc.

the Evangelicals, amongst them Berthold Haller, had previously taken their departure) decided in favour of the old faith. Zwingle and Œcolampadius were excommunicated, and Basel was requested to deprive the latter of his office as preacher, and to banish him from the country; which demand, however, was not complied with. On the contrary, Œcolampadius was received with great joy upon his return to Basel. But to Zwingle he wrote: "Let us pray Christ not to forsake His people, and to tread Satan under His feet shortly."

The loudest jubilation on the side of the Romanists issued from Thomas Murner. He it was who published the proceedings of the debate. That he falsified them, as he has long been accused of doing, cannot be proved. He was doubtless, however, blinded by passion, and thus prevented from doing justice to the adverse party in his criticism of the persons who composed it. Soon after the disputation he gave free course to his embitterment in his *Kirchendieb und Ketzerkalender* ["Calendar of Church Thieves and Heretics"], published in the year 1527. In this production he hurled the coarsest abuse upon the heads of Zwingle, Œcolampadius, and most of the other Reformers,[1] but at the same time erected an uncomely monument to himself.

[1] One of the Evangelical party, Dr. John Kopp, had published an evangelical calendar, in which biblical names and events were substituted for the names of the saints. As a parody on this, Murner's calendar appeared, with the names of heretics instead of the saints' names, and with satirical cuts in place of the figures of the zodiac. Amongst other things, Zwingle is called a "church thief" (his picture appears on the gallows), "a fiddler of the Holy Gospel, and a lutist of the Old and New Testaments." Œcolampadius is styled a *Niklaus Bader*, a *Leck-uns-im-Bad*. Leo Juda is termed "an evangelical bag-piper of the New Testament," and so on. Comp. KESSLER's *Sabbata*, and E. GÖTZINGER, *Zwei Kalender vom Jahre* 1527, Schaffhausen, 1865.

CHAPTER XIX.

RESULTS OF THE DISPUTATION OF BADEN—RETROGRADE MOVEMENTS IN BERN AND ZURICH—CALM PROGRESS OF ZWINGLE—LABOURS OF ŒCOLAMPADIUS AT BASEL—DISTURBANCES IN THAT CITY—DISPUTATION OF BERN AND COMPLETION OF REFORM THERE—REACTIONARY ATTEMPTS—PROCEEDINGS OF THE HASLITHALERS—FURTHER PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION—AMBROSE BLARER AND JOHN ZWICK AT CONSTANCE—JOHN VON BOZHEIM—THE REFORMATION IN THURGAU—EXCESSES IN THE CONVENT OF KATHRINENTHAL.

THE results of the disputation at Baden were at first anything but encouraging for the progress of the Reformation. While the disputants were still in session, it was rumoured that Œcolampadius had succumbed to the powerful Eck, and recanted.[1] After the close of the discussion, he was reported to have been completely vanquished. "Nay!" retorted the opponents of Eck, "Œcolampadius yielded not to force of logic, but to superiority of lungs." In Bern there was manifested a discontented feeling, which called forth a reaction. During the continuance of the discussion at Baden, on Whit-Monday of 1526, a meeting was held in the minster of Bern, at which deputies from the seven Catholic cantons appeared. Though James von Mai and other burghers of the town declared their readiness to stand by the word of God and not to suffer themselves to be misled by the vociferations of Eck, Faber, and Murner, the majority were on the side of those who determined to abide by the *ancient faith and the laudable*

[1] According to a letter written by Comander to Zwingle (*Opp.* vii. p. 514). Comp. the author's *Œcolampad.* p. 96, note.

old customs. "There was," says Bullinger, "great jubilation by reason of this decision, which, however, was but of brief standing." An attempt was made to constrain Haller to read mass again. He stedfastly refused to comply with this demand, and continued to preach the gospel "as meekly as he could."[1] In Zurich, also, reactionary longings made themselves felt. Some of the canons declined to attend upon the Scripture lections introduced by Zwingle. The Government, however, threatened to punish such delinquents by depriving them of so many quarters of corn in return for a corresponding number of absences. In the seven Catholic cantons especially, a spirit of defiance was observable.[2] These cantons demanded that Basel, St. Gall, and Mühlhausen should send away their Protestant preacher, and threatened a breach of the peace in case of non-compliance with this requisition.

Amid all these darkenings of the horizon, Zwingle calmly pursued the even tenor of his way in Zurich. He interested himself especially in the confirmation and strengthening of the inner constitution of the Reformation. He strove after the establishment of a rigorous system of marriage laws which should uphold the discipline of the family, and endeavoured to secure ecclesiastical order by his system of preachers.[3] But above all things, he sought to familiarize the Church with the grand ideas of divine legislation as developed in the Pentateuch. This portion of the Holy Scriptures formed the foundation of the discourses delivered by him at this time. His labours as a Reformer were likewise extended beyond Zurich through the medium of epistolary communication.

[1] As Bullinger expresses it. On account of this meekness of behaviour, Murner spitefully calls him a "choice keeper of silence in regard to his faith," and one who, even at Baden, would have preferred to dispute with the dumb than with those who could speak.

[2] "The disputation of Baden and the recent action of the Bernese made the seven cantons of the Confederacy so abominably arrogant and insolent, that they set themselves up as masters of all the other cities and cantons, and undertook to lay down laws for these, and even to *enforce* compliance with their demands."

[3] For particulars, see MÖRIKOFER, vol. ii. pp. 43 sqq.

A course similar to that of Zwingle at Zurich was pursued by Œcolampadius at Basel, though the position of the latter was rendered more difficult than that of Zwingle by the irresolution of the Government of Basel. The civil authorities here had, in the year 1525, turned to Erasmus as their oracle, and had by him been advised to await the action of a general council, and in the meantime to see that no scurrilous writings were issued on either side, to suffer the continuance of the old usages, and in general to strive to avoid all collision with the confederate cantons. Erasmus also recommended, however, that any monks who, in their youth, might unwillingly have been constrained to adopt the monastic life, should be allowed to forsake their cloisters.

An event in the history of the Reformation at Basel, not wholly without importance, was the introduction into the churches, at Easter of the year 1526, of a German version of the Psalms, and of singing in German. This innovation took place without the permission of the Government, and was, in fact, followed by its direct prohibition. Upon this, however, Œcolampadius sent an urgent petition to the authorities, begging them to reverse their decision, and stating, among other things, that the sacred songs sung in the familiar language of the people had brought tears to many eyes—tears which he likened to the joyful ones shed of yore at the rebuilding of Jerusalem (Ezra iii. 12). The Government returned no favourable answer to this entreaty. Notwithstanding this, however, the subject was brought up again at the feast of St. Lawrence (10th August); and two days later, after some discussion, the council consented to the practice of German singing in some few of the churches of the city, but continued to forbid it in others.[1] The Carthusian monk George found this singing less edifying, from *his* standpoint, than did the Evangelicals from *theirs*. He writes as follows in his chronicle:—"On the festival of St. Lawrence (10th

[1] Comp. Œcolampadius' Letters to Zwingle, *Opp.* vii. pp. 490 and 530, and the church archives of Basel.

August), in St. Martin's Church, the Lutherans, in spite of the express remonstrances of the council, commenced the singing of psalms done into German verses, after the Strassburg translation. These verses were in the style of the common popular ballad, and exceedingly rude and unpolished. An attempt had previously been made, at Easter-tide, to introduce this innovation, but had been promptly suppressed." Soon after the introduction of the German psalms, a new church liturgy was instituted. Œcolampadius also drew up a new catechism for children—a work that is remarkable for its great evangelical simplicity and clearness.[1] The catechism begins with the question, "Art thou a Christian?" to which the answer is, "Yes, by the grace of God." The main articles that form the basis of this catechism are the three contained in Luther's Shorter Catechism, and are arranged in the following order:—1. The Creed; 2. The Ten Commandments; 3. The Lord's Prayer [*Das Unser Vater*].

It formed a part of the ordinary tactics of the opponents of Protestantism to fill such pulpits as were under their control with preachers whose views were in harmony with their own, in order that these men might form a counterpoise to the dangerous innovations of the day. Thus an Erasmus Ritter had been called to Schaffhausen; and thus a Heim had been summoned to Bern. Thus, also, at this time the cathedral chapter of Basel called to the place of Selamonius Limperger,

[1] We cite the following in exemplification of the comprehensible style of this catechism in treating of morals:—Question, "How dost thou avoid idleness?"—Answer, "I do what my father and mother command me, and strive myself to learn and to accomplish something, in order that I may please them; I do not loiter in the streets." Question, "What sort of companions hast thou?"—Answer, "I avoid all boys who use improper language, who curse and swear, who gamble and lie, who do not like to go to church, but are always loafing about the streets." Question, "How dost thou behave thyself?"—Answer, "I eat and drink what I require, without longing for dainties; I rise quickly as soon as I awake; I speak when I am spoken to." It is further declared, "Pity dwells in the heart alone; I may use outward things as I need them, seeking also thereby to serve my neighbour, without giving offence to any." This system of "Instruction for Children" throughout avoids subtile doctrinal questions, thus displaying a fine pedagogical sense and tact, such as are not possessed by all catechists.

a favourer of the reformed doctrines, a man named Augustine Marius, of Freisingen, a native of Basel, who strove to the utmost of his ability to hinder the progress of the Reformation. Œcolampadius at first vainly endeavoured to come to an amicable understanding with this person, advancing, in the effort, more than half way to meet him. Instead, however, of being productive of any good, this course was followed by scenes of a mortifying character. Although the council had laid a fresh interdict upon pulpit revilings, the discord between the two parties increased. The representatives of both sides had set before the Government written arguments in support of their respective views, but the Government still refrained from coming to any decision. A decision seemed at length to emanate from heaven, clothed with the authority of a divine decree. Public misfortune—pestilence, hail, the explosion of the powder magazine near the Malzgasse: a disaster occasioned by lightning, and productive of death to about forty individuals—gave rise to uncharitable strictures on both sides.[1] Some discerned in these events a punishment for sacrilegious innovations, while others read therein an earnest admonition to the adherents of the old doctrines to turn to the pure gospel. Even on occasions of rejoicing at public feasts of the burghers, the religious discord made itself perceptible. Some of the guilds that favoured the new doctrines invited only Œcolampadius and those preachers who were in agreement with him to be present at their banquets. The remaining corporations, on the other hand, organized meetings at the Butchers' Chambers, and invited to them none but people of their own persuasion. The council, whose course, however, altered in the sequel, at length forbade further festivities on either side.[2] Here and there active hostilities

[1] Comp. the Carthusian chronicle.

[2] Hottinger, *Forts. von Joh. v. Müller*, vii. pp. 112 sqq., and the passages there cited from Ochs. The fact that some of the banquets of the Reformed party took place in Lent was in itself calculated to embitter the opposite side. A remnant of these dissensions may doubtless be found in the custom, still prevalent in Basel, of celebrating grand guild feasts on Ash Wednesday.

were commenced. In the year 1527, Œcolampadius posted some theses which he wished to discuss, and a Catholic priest tore them down and abused them. Thomas Geierfalk, an Augustinian monk and friend of Œcolampadius, in trying to rescue the theses, was attacked by the priest and wounded with a dagger.[1] This and similar scenes, as the council were unable to agree upon any mode of action, occasioned an extraordinary commotion amongst the burghers. On Tuesday the 22d October 1527, about four hundred citizens assembled in the Augustinian monastery, which had been abandoned by the monks, for the purpose of consulting as to the mode of putting an end to the differences. They resolved to despatch a delegation of thirty honourable men to the magistrates to petition them for a decision. But the authorities anticipated them. Whilst they were still in session, the chief guildmaster, James Mair, appeared, accompanied by two deputies from the council,[2] charged with an inquiry into the cause of the meeting. The burghers declared that they were desirous of presenting their case before the council through their own representatives, but they were finally persuaded to entrust the communication of their wishes to the deputies, who expressed the inclination of the Government to accede to all reasonable demands on the part of the burghers. Accordingly, on the following Sunday, 27th October, all the burghers were recommended by the council to betake themselves to their respective guilds, and were informed that uncalled-for assemblies of a mob-like nature were highly displeasing to the Government, and were strictly forbidden for the future. It was, however, further declared that it was not the intention of the council to lay any religious burdens upon the consciences of the people; they would leave it to the option of every individual to believe what he conscientiously held to be true and right; but no personal violence must be used on either side, nor was it allowable for any one to revile another on account of his faith.

[1] According to others, this took place a year later.
[2] James Götz the *Salzherr*, and Peter Ryff.

In Bern, also, the will of the people had, during this time, been repeatedly manifested; and this was especially the case in the country districts, a few villages having taken the law into their own hands and themselves abolished the mass and ceremonial of the Romish Church within their proper limits. In view of this condition of affairs, it was proposed that a disputation should be held, similar to that which had taken place six years before at Zurich, the result of which should determine the course to be pursued.[1] The Bishops of Constance, Basel, Lausanne, and Valais, whose dioceses extended into the precincts of Bern, were summoned to appear at this conference or forfeit their prerogatives. Friendly invitations to attend were likewise despatched to many other members of the Confederation and to numerous foreigners. Eck, who could not but be conscious that no such easy victory awaited him at Bern as that which he had formerly gained at Baden, did not manifest the slightest inclination "to follow the heretics into their corners and lurking-places." The five cantons refused safe-conducts to those who should resort to Bern from them. By the beginning of the year 1528, there was an arrival of clerical and lay deputies from several of the Swiss cantons, as well as from the bordering countries of Swabia and Bavaria. Zurich was the gathering-place for all who came from Eastern Switzerland. Guests from Germany (Constance, Ulm, Lindau) also made their appearance, and joined the assemblage at Zurich. On the 2d of January 1528 the deputies quitted the above-mentioned city, and proceeded, partly on foot and partly on horseback, with Burgomaster Röust at their head, and an escort of three hundred soldiers, to the allied city of Bern. This they reached, having

[1] See FISCHER, *Geschichte der Disputation zu Bern*, Bern, 1828; and Zwingle's works as published by SCHULER AND SCHULTHESS, *Deutsche Schriften*, ii. chap. i. pp. 53 sqq. Murner issued another of his abusive productions on this occasion. He says: "Herein is set forth the unchristian, outrageous, unlearned, and unlawful proclamation and undertaking on the part of the worshipful rulers of Bern, of a disputation in their graces' city—a proceeding which is opposed to the interests of Christendom and is contrary to the word of God and the gospel of Christ," etc. (Lucerne, 1527). Comp. BULLINGER, ii. pp. 413 sqq.

travelled by the way of Mellingen and Lenzberg, on the 4th of January. Bullinger gives a full account of all who attended the disputation. The number of clergy present amounted to 350. Several of the guests preached to the people in the churches during the days of the disputation; among such were Blarer, Bucer, Œcolampadius, Comthur Schmid, and Caspar Megander.[1] But of all who preached, Zwingle excited the greatest attention by the two sermons which he delivered on the 21st and the 28th of January. The former of these discourses treated on the Apostles' Creed, the different articles of which were successively explained. Who can blame the preacher for taking occasion, at the same time, to vindicate the orthodoxy of his own position, in regard to these articles, against the slanders of his opponents? In thus defending himself, he lingered especially over the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, and also over that of Christ's bodily presence in the sacramental bread; which latter dogma he most strenuously combated, as was to be expected. Since Christ, he remarks, has declared that those whom the Father has given Him are with Him in His glory, they must all, if the doctrine of the bodily presence be true, likewise be with Him in the bread; and in that case, he further observes, "the giant Christopher would have to squeeze himself into a very narrow compass to find accommodation in so small a bit of bread." With all his irony, however, Zwingle did not lose sight of the solemnity and dignity of the Lord's Supper, as appears from his beautiful comparison of the bread, when devoted to this religious purpose, with the flower of the field destined to adorn the bridal wreath, and the ring which bears the signet of the sovereign.[2] So powerful was Zwingle's

[1] All these sermons were printed and published by Froschauer at Zurich. Zwingle's sermons may be found in his *Werke*, vol. ii. pp. 201 sqq.

[2] "As a flower is more glorious when entwined in the wreath of a bride than it would be elsewhere, and yet, so far as its bare material is concerned, is the self-same thing whatsoever its position; and as a man who has stolen the signet of a king is held responsible for more than the mere value of the gold of which it is composed, though it differs not in material from any other gold ring, so in the Lord's Supper the bread is of one substance with all other bread, but the use

discourse that a mass priest, who was just then standing at the altar, and who had been listening eagerly to the preacher, divested himself of his robes on the spot, saying: "If such be the case in regard to the mass, I can no longer read it, either to-day or in future."

Zwingle delivered his second sermon immediately after the discardure and destruction of the images, which took place on the 22d of January. The organ in the minster of St. Vincent was broken to pieces on the same occasion. The organist took a sad farewell of his instrument, playing with expression for the last time the hymn, *Armer Judas, was hast du gethan?* ["Poor Judas, what hast thou done?"], before he was for ever separated from his beloved companion. Zwingle's sermon was a brief farewell discourse, in which he admonished the Bernese to constancy. In regard to the altars and images, the speaker expressed himself as follows: "There lie the altars and idols in the temple. This filth and rubbish must be cast out, in order that the incalculable sums which have hitherto been expended on foolish and worthless idols may henceforth be appropriated to the living image of God (the poor). They are of a weak or a contentious spirit who bewail the downfall of idols: such persons may now clearly see that there is nothing holy inherent in these images; they may be handled and tossed about like any other bits of wood or stone. There lies one with its head off, another has lost an arm, etc. Now if the saints who are in the presence of God felt themselves outraged by such treatment of images that bear their names, and if they had the power that we (not they themselves) have ascribed to them, no one would have been able to move these images from their places, much less could they have been beheaded or maimed."

But we have been anticipating the course of events, and must return to the disputation. This began on the 6th of

and dignity of the Supper *confers upon it a loftiness of character* which causes it to differ from other bread." He indignantly repudiates the charge of having spoken of the sacramental bread as common bread [*gemenies Beckenbrot*].

January, and lasted until the 25th of the same month. Joachim von Wadt (Vadian) of St. Gall, Nicholas Briefer, dean of St. Peter's in Basel, Conrad Schilling, and the Abbot of Gottstadt (as the representative of the Provost of Interlaken, who was ill) presided on this occasion. No discussion of special importance took place. The reporters of the Popish party [1] themselves confessed the Papists' lack of learned disputants, and the great need that was felt of the acumen of an Erasmus. The most distinguished debaters on the Papist side were Konrad Treger, provincial of Freiburg, who had attended the disputation at Baden as a deputy of the Bishop of Lausanne, and the youthful John Buchstab, a schoolmaster of Zofingen; these, however, were unable to prevail against the logic of Zwingle, Berthold Haller, Francis Kolb, Capito, and Bucer. Yet we must not omit to mention the occurrence of dissension in the very camp of the Reformed party, in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; Benedict Burgauer, a pastor of St. Gall, contended for the Lutheran view, in which he was supported by Pastor Althammer of Nuremburg. Notwithstanding this difference of opinion, Bern was the scene of another victory on the part of the Zwinglian doctrine—a fact which caused Luther irefully to declare: "The children in the streets are rejoicing that they are delivered from a baked deity." [2]

It was the advice of Dean Briefer, one of the presidents, that any alteration in established usage should be gradually and cautiously brought about. The colleagues of the dean, however, replied that the city of Bern had already had sufficient opportunity afforded it, by the conference that had just taken place, to decide upon the nature of the religion which had hitherto prevailed, and to discover what part of it was divine,

[1] Among them especially the priest James Münster of Solothurn. See Mörikofer, vol. ii. p. 102.

[2] This expression occurs in a letter to Gabriel Zwilling, dated 7th March. See De Wette, vol. iii. No. 359: *Bernæ in Helvetiis finita disputatio est; nihil factum, nisi quod Missa abrogata et pueri in plateis cantent, se esse a Deo pisto liberatos.* Luther also predicted that Zwingle would come to a bad end.

and what, on the other hand, was of mere human institution. They were therefore of opinion that vigorous and intrepid measures should at once be resolved upon.

This latter suggestion was adopted. Upon the departure of the deputies, the city council assembled the burghers and residents of Bern, and acquainted them with the will of the Government,—its inclination to do away with all abuses and to introduce a purified doctrine. The proposal was received with joy, and was speedily set in operation by a mandate issued on the 3d of February. Evangelical preaching on the basis of the Scriptures was thereby enjoined upon all pastors of the canton as one of the duties of their office, the abolition of the mass and images was confirmed, permission to marry was accorded to priests, and a settlement was made with the occupants of the cloisters and religious foundations. All connection with the Swiss bishops was at the same time dissolved, and the State Government was empowered to receive the oaths of fidelity of preachers and deans.

In the city of Bern, some support was still afforded to the adherents of the Romish Church by the Diessbach family, who continued the celebration of the mass in their private worship. In the country also, and especially in the Bernese Oberland, the secularization of the cloister of Interlaken gave rise to disturbances which threatened to become serious. The Haslithalers, by a vote of 151 against 111, reinstated the mass in their own district in the summer of 1528, and, in connection with the people of Unterwalden, who gave them encouragement and despatched help to them across the Brünig mountains, undertook an expedition against Bern. They were joined in their march by the men of Grindelwald and the inhabitants of the Frutiger and Simmen valleys. Sprigs of fir, worn upon the hat, formed the badge of the anti-Reformers. Bern now, like her sister cities Zurich and Basel, was obliged, in the midst of her period of reformation, to confront a peasant insurrection which began to assume formidable proportions, differing, however, from the previous uprisings, through the

fact that it originated not with Anabaptist ultra-Protestants, but with the no less fanatical opposition party of the Reactionists. Bern took decisive measures for her own protection; the insurrection was quelled without bloodshed, but the Oberhaslithalers were severely punished by being deprived of their banners and public seals.

Nor was this an isolated occurrence. The efforts of the opposition party to stem the current of the Reformation in Switzerland became daily more manifest. These efforts, however, were met by an increasingly urgent demand, on the part of the Protestant party, for a thorough accomplishment of reform in all cases in which half-way measures had been resorted to. Such measures were now, in the development of a general conflict, felt to be utterly unsatisfactory and inexpedient.

Of the highest importance for the confirmation of the Reformation in Switzerland was the more intimate connection which took place at this time between Zurich and Bern. On the 25th of June 1528, the two cities entered into an offensive and defensive alliance, which was to last for [illegible] years, and was designed not only for the protection of the faith of their respective states and people, but also for the defence of the subjects of the so-called "common provinces," who, on account of their religious tenets, were not infrequently oppressed and brought to punishment by the federal bailiffs and officials. The privilege of joining this alliance was also extended to other confederate cantons and other cities. The influence of Zwingle now began to be more powerfully felt in Bern.[1]

The tide of reformation was pressing forward at this time in East and West Switzerland. In Biel, where Dr. Wittenbach had died two years before, the images were abolished. In some other places, among which may be mentioned the canton of Glarus, the effort for reform gave rise to dissensions. The parishes of Matt (in the little valley)

[1] Comp. MÖRIKOFER, vol. ii. pp. 107 sqq., 123 sqq.

and Schwanden were the first to rid themselves of their images. One day when the men of Schwanden went to the town of Glarus to market, the women gathered themselves together and cast the images out of the church. The adherents of the old system, on the other hand, bestirred themselves, and disturbed the worship of the Evangelicals with the sound of drums, etc. Images were treated with the utmost contumely at Wesen. The people placed them at the cross-roads, and told them to betake themselves whither they chose—to Schwytz, Glarus, Zurich, or Chur.[1] In Toggenburg the peasants rose against the Abbot of St. John's. A throng of young men burst into the cloister church, destroyed the images and altars, and drove away the abbot, who took refuge at Feldkirch. At Altstätten, in the valley of the Rhine, Hans Valentine Fortmüller, a native of Waldshut, preached with much success, in spite of the opposition of Dr Winkler.[2] The Reformation had by this time gained ground on the shores of the lake of Constance, also in Thurgau. In the city of Constance, to the history of the Reformation of which we are now brought, there were two men whom we may designate as the Reformers of that place. These were Ambrose Blarer and Dr. John Zwick.[3] The Blarers (Blaurers) were an old patrician family of Gyrspag, a seigniorial manor near Emmishofen, which had given various bishops and abbots to the country. Ambrose was born at Constance, on the 12th of April 1492. His father was a member of the council of that city. His mother, the excellent Margaret von Blarer, was distinguished for her active beneficence. She was the comforter of all the needy, and the foster-mother of poor and destitute children.[4] Left fatherless at an early age, young Ambrose received his

[1] BULLINGER, ii. p. 46.

[2] HOTTINGER (continuation of JOHN VON MULLER), ii. 208.

[3] For a notice of Blarer, comp. THEODOR PRESSEL, *Ambrosius Blaurers, des schwäbischen Reformators Leben und Schriften*, Stuttg. 1861 (vol. ix. of the *Väter und Begründer*); KEIM, *Ambr. Blarer*, 1861; HARTMANN in Herzog's *Realenc.*

[4] An attractive portrait of this good woman is given by FELIX VON ORELLI in Piper's *Evangelischer Kalender* for 1852.

education from the Benedictine fathers in the monastery of Alpirsbach. By them the aspiring youth was sent, at a later period, to Tubingen, where he became intimately associated with Melanchthon. In the year 1515 he returned to his "beloved studies" in the cloister. He had already been advanced to the position of prior when he, for the first time, made acquaintance with the writings of Luther. Until then, he tells us, though he had taken counsel with "many subtile hair-splitting doctors," he had never yet "looked the Holy Scriptures in the face, in all their clearness and refulgence, but had beheld them only through the cloud of human commandments, doctrines, and interpretation." A new light dawned upon him with the commencement of his acquaintance with Luther; but at the same time, the peace which he had hitherto enjoyed in the cloister was disturbed. His abbot and the brethren of his order would have nothing to do with the new doctrine. Blarer quitted the convent in 1521 and returned to his native city, whence he issued a written vindication of his conduct. In the year 1524 the council of Constance commissioned him to attack the invocation of the Virgin. In the following year John Zwick became associated with him. Zwick, who was born in 1496, was, like Blarer, descended from a patrician family,[1] which had removed from Switzerland to Constance. According to the custom of the time, he had been destined to be a prebend from his cradle. The Abbot of Reichenau designated him as the future pastor of Riedlingen, one of the five Austrian cities on the Danube; and to this preferment the hopes of the boy and youth at first attached themselves. The promise of ecclesiastical advancement did not, however, prevent him from voluntarily extending the circle of his studies. He applied himself to the study of jurisprudence, under the direction of the learned Zasius, at Freiburg. Before entering upon his charge at Riedlingen, in 1522, he married, contrary to the warning of his bishop, who had cautioned him against

[1] The names Zwick, Zwicky, Zwicker, were originally only different forms of the same family name. Comp. KEIM'S article in Herzog's *Realenc.* viii. p. 602 sq.

innovations. Zwick at first confined himself to the simple preaching of pure Christianity, laying special stress upon matters pertaining to the inner man, and refraining from any discussion of external ceremonies. But even this course of action brought him into conflict with his clerical associates. In October of 1523 Zwick attended the second disputation of Zurich, which resulted for him in the strengthening of his reformatory principles. Driven from his parish at Riedlingen, he arrived at Constance at exactly the right moment. In connection with Blarer we may from this time behold him pressing forward, step by step, in the cause of reform, to the vexation of Romish sympathizers.[1] In May 1526, both preachers besought the council to institute measures for the holding of a religious conference, which accordingly took place in the following year (1527). A decisive influence was exerted in Constance by the happy termination of the disputation of Bern (1528), at which Blarer was personally present. On the 10th of March succeeding the last-mentioned disputation, the two councils of Constance decided that it was "better to fall under the disfavour of men than to incur the wrath of God." The abolition of the mass, altars, and images was resolved upon, although not immediately accomplished, for it was not until 1531 that the work of the Reformation in Constance might be regarded as completed.[2] As early as 1526, however, Bishop Hugo von Landenberg had found himself compelled to abandon the venerable episcopal see of Constance and to take up his residence in Mörsburg, at which place he also exercised his inquisitorial

[1] The Romanists composed the following bad verses in relation to both Blarer and Zwick :—

"Der Blarer und der Zwick,
Der Langnas und der Dick,
Hingen's all' an einem Strick,
So hätt' Constanz wieder Glück."

["Blarer and Zwicky,
Long-nose and Thicky,
Were they dangling from one rope,
Then might Constance have some hope."
—Tr.]

[2] After the Smalkaldian War, Constance was lost to the cause of the Reformation. Of this later. Comp. VIERORDT, *Gesch. des Protestantismus in Constanz.* (in SCHREIBER'S *Taschenbuch für Gesch. und Alterthum in Süddeutschland*, vol. iii., 1841).

powers. The matin priest of Sernatingen, John Hüglin of Lindau, was tried before a spiritual court, and burned at Mörsburg on the 10th of May 1527.[1] The cathedral chapter of Constance retired to Ueberlingen, accompanied by a worthy canon who for some time had been a representative of the liberal tendency, but who was unable to reconcile himself to the Reformation and its consequences—we refer to John von Bozheim, a friend of Erasmus and, for a time, of Blarer.[2] On the 10th of October 1527, Constance concluded a treaty of burghership with Zurich, which took effect on the 25th of December following, and was to continue for ten years.

With the Reformation in Constance, that of Thurgau was in measure connected,[3] though movements of reform had previously been excited in the latter province by Zurich and Schaffhausen. The Anabaptist and kindred tendencies had also early found representatives in Thurgau, among whom may be mentioned Stephen Stör of Diessenhofen, and Ludwig Hätzer of Bischoffzell. In Stein, on the Rhine, Erasmus Schmidt preached to crowded audiences, and at Dissenhofen the gospel was proclaimed by Fortmüller, who had been driven from Waldshut. A decisive influence in favour of the Thurgovian Reformation was wielded by the Diet of Weinfelden, in December 1528. It was there determined that all compulsion in matters of faith should cease. In consequence of this resolution, images and altars were abolished, and the reform was accomplished with such rapidity that in less than a month the only place in Upper Thurgau in which mass was celebrated was Bischoffzell. The canons of this place for some time resisted the Reformation. On the 25th of January 1529, however, the town council demanded of the chapter whether the latter would undertake to defend the use of the mass and images from the Scriptures, and in default of

[1] BULLINGER (i. p. 340) places the whole occurrence in the previous year.
[2] WALCHNER, *Johann von Bozheim*, Schaffhausen, 1863.
[3] PUPIKOFER, *Geschichte des Thurgaus*, vol. ii.

a satisfactory answer, the images and altars were removed. Blarer was summoned thither to complete the Reformation. On the 26th of April in the same year, a similar occurrence took place at Frauenfeld. Some of the cloisters of Thurgau voluntarily embraced the Reformation; of these, Fischingen was one. The nuns at Kathrinenthal, on the other hand, offered the most obstinate resistance to the Reformed party, and were in some cases treated with rudeness and violence. Some burghers of Diessenhofen, to whose jurisdiction the convent belonged, proposed to beat in the doors with axes. This the council would not allow, but it commanded the abolition of the old ritual of worship, to which the nuns were passionately attached. The prioress and two of the principal sisters made their escape to Schaffhausen. Ineffectual attempts were made to win the remaining occupants of the cloister by persuasion, or to intimidate them by threats. Messengers were despatched to Kathrinenthal from both parties,—from Zurich, Bern, Glarus, and Solothurn, as well as from the three cantons. At last the people of Diessenhofen broke into the church of the convent and burned the images without mercy. As those that represented St. Nicholas and St. Katharine would not take fire, they were flung into the Rhine. This piece of brutality could have no other effect than to increase the fanaticism of the nuns. They defended themselves most desperately with stones, billets of wood, and broom-sticks—such weapons as they had at hand. But all was of no avail. Their rude besiegers caroused in the sacred rooms and amused themselves by threatening the nuns with the hangman. An old official of the nunnery, who strove to take the part of the terrified women, was locked up in the tower, after having his teeth knocked out. Messengers again appeared from the four cantons mentioned above. Long discourses were addressed to the nuns, in the hope of inducing them to receive the word of God ("which," their would-be reformers declared, was "as clear as day") and to abandon the dress of their order. Vain endeavour! The nuns threw

themselves on their knees and begged for mercy. They appealed to all the eight cantons, but without effect. They were forcibly stripped of their conventual robes, which were committed to the flames, and it was even recommended that they should be compelled to attend upon the preaching of the Reformed ministers. A few succeeded in saving themselves from further indignities by flight.[1]

Such shameful excesses as the above should be neither concealed, palliated, nor excused by history. The history of the Reformation has its dark shadows, which continually remind us of the truth, that only where heavenly wisdom sways the soul, can the word of God, preached in wisdom and gentleness, find entrance; that a false zeal does but consume instead of edifying, and excites the lowest passions, instead of implanting a noble courage and awakening confidence in the good cause.

[1] HOTTINGER, *in loc.* pp. 206-208, from contemporaneous sources.

CHAPTER XX.

VICTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN BASEL—ORDER OF REFORM—THE UNIVERSITY—SIMON GRYNÆUS AND SEBASTIAN MÜNSTER—DEATH OF ERASMUS — REFORMATION IN ST. GALL AND SCHAFFHAUSEN—HOSTILE ATTITUDE OF THE ROMISH AND EVANGELICAL PARTIES—SEPARATE ALLIANCES—FIRST WAR OF CAPPEL—DIFFERENT VIEWS OF LUTHER AND ZWINGLE CONCERNING THE EMPLOYMENT OF FORCE—ZWINGLE'S HYMN.

AS we saw in the preceding chapter, Zurich and Bern, East and West Switzerland, had, at the time of which we are speaking, been brought into a closer connection with each other through the issue of the Bernese disputation. The links of the chain formed by the adherents of the new faith, who were quick to extend to one another the hand of fellowship and aid, now become more and more closely riveted; whilst, on the contrary, the old bonds of the Helvetic Confederation were dissolving and hastening to a violent rupture.

Basel itself could no longer maintain its intermediate posture. A decision was at length to be reached even there. The year commencing with the spring of 1528 and closing with that of 1529 was a period of both civil and ecclesiastical ferment. On Good Friday, 10th April, five burghers of the spinners' guild, without the knowledge of Œcolampadius, broke in pieces the altars and images in St. Martin's Church,[1] and on the following Easter Monday twenty-four burghers removed the images from the church of the Augustinians. The authorities arrested the iconoclasts—a procedure which excited great indignation among their comrades of the spinners'

[1] [The church of Œcolampadius.]

guild. The latter resolved to lay before the council a petition on behalf of their imprisoned brethren. As they were about proceeding to the guild house for the purpose of carrying their resolution into effect, they were joined at the corn market by 200 other burghers who had determined to assist in supporting the cause of the prisoners. The council, being at that time in session, despatched some of its members, with the chief guild-master at their head, to the market to inquire into the intentions of the assembled burghers. A committee of thirty-four gave the following reply to the deputies from the council:—"A wise Government might, by a vigorous mandate, at once abolish the continual dissensions of the preachers, whose disputes give rise to so many unpleasantnesses. The idols" (thus the images were styled) "cannot surely be valued so highly as to cause the imprisonment or punishment of honest citizens. We are sufficiently instructed by God's word that image service is an abomination to God. We therefore request that the prisoners may be released, and that an end may be put to the insults and slanders of the Papists."

This demand having been made known to the council, another embassage was sent to the assembled burghers, commanding them to disperse, but directing, at the same time, that a committee of six should remain and await the decision of the senate. After some opposition, the burghers submitted to this arrangement, begging, however, for a "satisfactory answer;" they then withdrew, only half appeased, and with many murmurs, to their guild hall. The request of the burghers was the subject of a lengthy deliberation in the council; and when at last an answer was resolved upon, it was not quite so *satisfactory* as might have been desired. "The prisoners," thus ran the reply, "shall be released, and a pardon shall be granted to all who have incurred the displeasure of the Government in this matter." In the foregoing sentence the burghers acquiesced, it is true, yet without suppressing the wish for a final decision in regard to the images. Their desire was complied with a few days later, though the council

still refrained from any but half-way measures; this middle course on the part of the Government was owing to the fact that a minority of the burghers and, above all, some members of the council were still opposed to the Reformation. The decree of the 18th of April provided that, "to please the Reformed, the images should be removed by workmen commissioned by the authorities from the churches of St. Martin, St. Leonard, the Augustinians and Franciscans, and the Hospital. In order, however, that the adherents of the old faith might celebrate the worship of God in *their* way, the choir and associate chapels of St. Leonard and the Franciscans should continue to be adorned as before, remaining shut, however, to prevent vexation to any during the observance of the reformed service. In the other churches of the city, all the ornaments and images should remain unchanged and unmolested." Those who opposed this mandate, as well as all who should band themselves together for rebellious purposes, or create any disturbance whatever, were threatened with punishment, extending even to loss of life.

These half-way measures were adhered to for some time. No further tumults occurred during the following summer and autumn. On the contrary, Œcolampadius availed himself of this season for an initial church visitation, which he conducted through the medium of his deacon, Jerome Bothanus, giving expression to his gentle and pious sentiments in a pastoral letter to his ministerial brethren throughout the country.[1] Towards the end of the year, however, the fire, which had all the while been smouldering beneath the ashes, burst out afresh. There had been, now and again, various collisions between the two parties, and harsh words had been exchanged even in the council, in consequence of which one of the members declared that he would not attend another meeting unless earnest measures were taken to secure justice and peace.

On Wednesday the 23d of December, three hundred burghers from all the different guilds assembled at the hall of

[1] This letter may be found in BURCKHARDT'S *Reformations geschichte Basels.*

the Gardeners' Company, and drew up a respectful and moderate petition to the council, for the purpose of obtaining from that body a final decision in the matter. The petitioners disclaimed at the outset all evil and seditious designs. "If we knew of one among us," they declared, "who by a single word should discover a disorderly and quarrelsome intent, we would accuse him to your excellencies as a disobedient and disloyal person." They were moved, they asserted, to the step which they were taking solely by a desire for the glory of God and of the faith, and by consideration for the peace and unity of the whole city of Basel. The petitioners next demonstrated how little attention had been paid to the magistratic ordinance in reference to pulpit dissensions, and how much envy and hatred the latter had occasioned among the burghers. "Dear and gracious sirs," the address continued, "what is such discordant preaching save a root of many vices, a cloak for hypocrisy, a bewilderment to entangled consciences, a fortifier of the wicked, a suppression of the truth, an awakening of the wrath of God, and a disgrace to the whole city of Basel?" The Government was therefore entreated to put a stop to these disorders, and to remove all preachers whose sermons did not harmonize with the gospel. It was also requested that the mass should be abolished until the priests had satisfactorily vindicated it, in which case the burghers would again receive it. "If, however, it be wrong and an abomination in the sight of God, why should we, for the sake of the priests, draw down God's wrath upon us and fight against truth and the Holy Spirit?" The plea that the church councils had decided in favour of the mass was, the petitioners affirmed, powerless to change their minds, since it was well known that even the councils had made mistakes and contradicted each other. Nor had the discussions at Baden and Bern been of any avail, "though they had cost the city of Basel a pretty penny." "If, however, it be urged that no one's faith can be forced, we would state that we do not desire impossibilities; for God alone gives faith.

Nevertheless, false teachers and other scandals should not be endured by any Christian government, any more than a mother should suffer her daughters to associate with bad women, and excuse herself by saying that God must take care of them." It was stated, furthermore, that the distrust that had manifested itself among the burghers upon various occasions, such as on guard duty and in field service,[1] already exceeded that which existed between Jews and Christians, the Evangelicals, who were regarded as apostate Christians, being more detested by the Romanists than Jews. Should it be objected that it would be difficult to decide in such a case, in which learned men were themselves at odds, such an objection would be like blasphemy, since it would make it appear as if Christ had given us a law, and commanded us to keep it, on pain of everlasting perdition, and yet had failed to make that law intelligible to every layman. Who would seek to compel another to travel a certain road and yet be anxious to conceal that road from him? What is it to us, said the burghers, that a few learned doctors, actuated by their great avarice, envy, and pride, refuse to receive the truth? It is not hidden on that account. The burghers then reminded the council that the opposite party had already resorted to arms, and urged that they themselves would be forced to answer violence with violence, unless the illegal measures of their opponents were combated. "As we," thus closes the address, "are seeking the glory of God and the peace of the entire city of Basel, we shall not and cannot desist from our entreaties, night and day, until your excellencies graciously hear us; for there is nothing in this world that we have more at heart, unless, indeed, we should discover that our petition is dishonourable to God and hurtful to the city of Basel—an alternative which, however, will not occur. We therefore beseech your excellencies without further delay to lend a gracious and fatherly ear to obedient burghers."

[1] Literally "on journeys" [*auf den Reisen*], by which, however, according to the usage of the day, military expeditions were meant.

As soon as the opposite party, consisting of the inhabitants of Little Basel and the suburb of Spahlen, heard of the vigorous but legitimate proceedings of the burghers at Gardeners' Hall, they betook themselves to arms, in the hope of violently dispersing the friends of the Reformation. This was the first step towards a disturbance of the public peace. It was met, on the part of the Government, by a deputation. But instead of receiving the law-abiding petition of the majority of burghers, Burgomaster Meltinger, a zealous adherent of the old faith, refused to have anything to do with it, and adjured the burghers to proceed immediately to their homes. They, however, persisted in their demand for a hearing, and declined to disperse until Adelberg Meyer, the other burgomaster, and the head guildmaster, James Meyer (zum Hirschen),[1] took charge of their address and assured them that they should have an answer in two days.

The peace was, however, of no long continuance. The night after St. Stephen's day, between the 25th and 26th of December, the burghers of Little Basel and Spahlen again took up arms. The opposing party then also assembled, numbering at first but 800; repairing to their former meeting-place at Gardeners' Hall, they increased their force to 3000 by arming the apprentices. Thus the burghers confronted each other, armed, in a war of creeds. On the same night, amid these hostile preparations, the council gathered, faint-hearted and irresolute. It was already reported, furthermore, that federal representatives were expected, who would endeavour to mediate a peace. Message after message meantime was sent to the burghers; they were admonished, soothed, advised to hope for better times to come. The Reformed party always listened most willingly to Adelberg and James Meyer (of the Stag), whilst they put no con-

[1] This James Meyer zum Hirschen must be carefully distinguished from James Meyer zum Hasen. The latter was an opponent of the Reformation, while the former was one of its friends. See Ochs, vol. v. pp. 313, 434, 449, 632.

fidence in the Papist Meltinger. After much discussion, it was at last agreed that committees should be chosen from each side. The Reformed delegated fifty men, who remained at the Gardeners' Hall; the Catholics also named some, who took up their quarters at the Fishmongers' Hall. The latter, in their turn, now presented a petition to the council, begging them to leave things as they were. Advice was daily sought, and good advice was scarce. Only two of the gates of the city were left open at this time, and those were guarded by a strong watch. The minds of all were in a state of expectancy and excitement. Finally, deputies from Zurich and Bern made their appearance, Nicholas Manuel being one of those from the last-mentioned city. Others also arrived from Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Zug, Solothurn, and Schaffhausen, and ambassadors were received from Strassburg and Mühlhausen. A commission, composed of four members of the council and four burghers, was appointed to draw up proposals, with the following result. It was suggested that a public discussion concerning the mass should take place, two weeks after Whitsunday, in the church of the Franciscans, in presence of all the burghers, and that no arguments should be considered valid at this meeting save such as should be drawn from the word of God. After the close of the disputation, the vote of the people should be taken at the halls of the different guilds, and a decision be given in favour of the majority. The preachers were recommended to make thorough preparation for the discussion in the meantime, and for that end to assemble at least twice a week, to confer amicably upon the disputed points. Any who taught contrary to the Holy Scriptures should be called to account for their doctrines; and, finally, no one should usurp the office of the Government by interfering with the mass or the images. No one should force another to attend mass or violently keep him therefrom, but every man should be free to act in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. This proposal was made known to the assembled burghers. The council called together

all the guilds and companies, ordering the Evangelicals to assemble at the church of the Franciscans, while the Roman Catholics were to repair to that of the Dominicans. Twenty-five hundred appeared at the former place and six hundred at the latter. From this it became manifest that more than four-fifths of the burgher population were upon the side of the Reformation; many, however, who were undecided, remained at home without voting at all. The minority, nevertheless, persisted stedfastly in their views and their demands. They entered a formal protest against the foregoing resolutions, and submitted the following statement to the senate. They earnestly entreated that the lords councillors would consider well this weighty and most important affair, remembering that their canton (the canton of Basel) was not like Zurich and Bern, which drew their rents, taxes, and other revenues from their own dominions; while Basel, on the other hand, derived the most considerable part of its income from the neighbouring duchy of Austria and the margraviate of Baden, neither of which countries was favourable to the Reformation. It would be well, therefore, they suggested, to act circumspectly and do nothing that might prove injurious to the city. They also endeavoured to vindicate their extraordinary assumption of arms and to give it a legitimate colouring. They had perceived, they declared, that the senate was no longer master of the city, and had therefore assembled under arms to see for themselves who would oppose the Government; they would thus have been ready, in case of need, cheerfully to lay down their lives for their Government, as faithful subjects. In regard to the proposed points, they could by no means consent to them. They hoped that their priests had instructed them aright; they would sacrifice their lives rather than suffer that their wives and children should no longer be instructed agreeably to the doctrines of their forefathers. They trusted that they might be permitted to abide by the former mandate, which granted them five churches, with which number they would rest satisfied.

And they begged, in conclusion, that they might be allowed to retain undisturbed their old faith and ecclesiastical usages.

By this plea in favour of the old faith, which, though it proceeded from the minority, was yet as decided in its character as any that had been urged *against* that faith, the council beheld itself plunged into new embarrassments. It stood between two fires. The mandate just issued could not be recalled without exciting the indignation of the majority; nor was it desirable to leave the minority entirely unsatisfied, since even *its* threats were productive of apprehension. This condition of affairs led to a renewal of the command that no person should disturb another in the performance of his religious exercises, or revile him on account of his faith, under penalty of being fined five pounds; in addition to this, the singing of hymns in German was forbidden in all churches in which it had not yet been introduced—a measure in favour of the adherents of the old faith which afforded a palpable contradiction to the plan of reformation that had been so valiantly ushered in. But these half-way measures were of no avail. The confederate envoys had no sooner departed than fresh disturbances arose. The Catholic priests could not be induced to attend the weekly meetings. On account of this refusal, they were suspended from the exercise of their official functions, so that for a period of fourteen days there was neither preaching nor mass in the cathedral, St. Ulrick's, St. Peter's, or St. Theodore's. Some of the pillars of the old faith, such as the Suffragan-Bishop Marius and the Dominican monk Pelargus, left the city; Ludwig Ber, professor of theology in the University and provost of St. Peter's, was also among the missing. This flight of the shepherds at a time when the flock was in danger, was far from making a favourable impression upon the latter, and the number of the adherents of the old faith daily diminished. Notwithstanding the now languishing condition of the Romish party, however, its members continued their efforts for the mastery. With the approval of Burgomaster Meltinger, Sebastian Müller, preacher

at St. Peter's, ascended the pulpit of that church, despite the interdict of the Government, and endeavoured to stir up the people against the followers of the new faith. Several of the latter, apprehending mischief, purposely entered the church, and were roundly abused by their fellow-citizens of the Catholic persuasion. There ensued a lively war of words, which came near resulting in personal hostilities.

Those of the burghers who were in favour of reform were greatly incensed at this occurrence, especially in view of the fact that Müller had had the temerity to enter the pulpit in opposition to the mandate of the Government. They pressed for a vigorous administration of justice. Meltinger, who had arbitrarily granted the controversialist permission to preach, found himself compelled to make a formal apology before the senate, which public humiliation of the burgomaster seemed somewhat to pacify the burghers. But the suspicion that a number of the council,—chiefly such members as were related to priests,—and at the head of all such the Burgomaster Meltinger, were designedly impeding the Reformation by artifice, was now too deeply rooted to be readily removed. The obstruction caused by such men must be removed.

The Lenten season of the year 1529 was a stormy one. On the Monday before Ash Wednesday, 800 burghers assembled in the church of the Franciscans, and at the close of morning prayers resolved to demand of the council that all its members who were unfavourable to the pure word of God, or who had relatives in the priesthood, should, without compromising their dignity, vacate their seats until the matter at issue had been decided. This was a bold request. The council endeavoured to demonstrate to the burghers the difficulty of compliance with it. They begged that they might at least be allowed time for consideration, and promised to return an answer on the following day. But the distrustful ones among the burghers beheld in this delay only a cover for new evasions. They all, indeed, retired, with the avowed intention of awaiting the decision of the senate; but at six o'clock in

the evening, suspicion and impatience impelled them to reassemble, when they declared that they would have an answer that very night. The city now assumed a critical and warlike aspect. Armed men patrolled the streets and bivouacked in the public squares. Guards were posted at the halls of the vintners, the leather dressers, and the spinners. Chains were fastened across the streets, cannon were mounted, and the city gates, the armoury, and the towers were occupied. Vessels containing resin were placed in the streets and kept burning throughout the entire night. The coming of the morrow was anticipated with many apprehensions. Burgomaster Meltinger, in company with his son-in-law, Egloff von Offenburgh, had already taken refuge in flight, having descended the Rhine in a little boat, under cover of the night and the mist.[1] Other members of the council likewise took their departure from the city by stealth. These occurrences strengthened the suspicions and the courage of the Reformed, and seemed to augment the justice of their demand.

By dawn the next day the number of men under arms was increased to two thousand. The council already manifested a disposition to accede to the burghers' demand for the withdrawal of the adherents of Catholicism; the Catholic members, however, opposed this arrangement and called for federal arbitration. Messengers were therefore despatched in haste to the cantons of Zurich and Bern, and every effort was employed meantime to appease the public mind. Political questions respecting the constitution of Basel were involved in the demand of the burghers—a fact which added to the intricacy of the matter. It was with difficulty that Hans Irmi, the popular orator, whom Œcolampadius describes as a man of admirable constancy and fidelity, succeeded in calming the excited spirits of the burghers.

A chance occurrence gave a more rapid and less dangerous turn to the affair than had been deemed possible. A patrol, consisting of forty burghers, in going their rounds entered the

[1] [See D'AUBIGNÉ's *History of the Reformation*,, vol. iv. p. 268.]

cathedral; and one of the men made a thrust with his halberd at an altar closet, so that an image contained in it fell down and broke. Encouraged by this circumstance, the other men followed his example. Some priests and their supporters ran to the scene of action, when hot words were exchanged, notwithstanding which the forty men soon after quietly withdrew. At the Spitalsprung (the Münsterberg), however, they encountered a force of three hundred, who, having already heard of the foregoing collision, were hastening to their assistance. What need was there for further deliberation? A sense of superiority took possession of the armed band, and, without waiting for orders from a higher authority, they proceeded to action. Having arrived at the cathedral, they burst open the doors, which had in the meantime been shut by the priests, and then commenced a Vandalic shattering and smashing of images, both in the cathedral and also in the neighbouring churches of St. Ulric and St. Alban. The fragments were next piled up outside the churches, and fires were kindled, by the crackling flames of which the guards warmed themselves. Similar occurrences soon took place in the other churches of the Great Basel. The people of Little Basel, however, upon hearing of these proceedings, gathered up their images in all haste, and, with the permission of the authorities, stored them in the lofts of the church. The stone figures at the gate of the suburb of Spahlen were also protected from the general assault.

Who now should allay the storm? The deputies of the Government, on recommending moderation, received the following blunt reply: "What you, with all your deliberations, have been unable to accomplish in three years, *we* have brought about in one hour." Some of the more turbulent spirits suggested that the city hall should be stormed and the council compelled to take some decisive measure. But the good sense of the majority sufficed to keep the evil inclinations of such brawlers in check.

What course remained for the council but to give their assent to what had transpired, and to impress upon it the

stamp of legality? Only thus could the inchoate revolution be turned back into the channel of reformation. This was done. A mandate was issued in regard to the discardure of the images and the abolition of the mass; and on the very next day, which was Ash Wednesday, it was decreed that the fragments remaining from the shattered images, pictures, and altars should be distributed among the poor for firewood. This plan, however, giving rise to many disputes, which resulted in numerous frays and wounds, most of the woodwork was brought to the square of the cathedral, divided into several heaps, and burned; so that, as the wit of the victorious party expressed it, the saints certainly kept their *Ash* Wednesday on this occasion.[1] A similar course was pursued in the squares of the other churches; and even the citizens of Little Basel were obliged to abandon to the flames those treasures that they had so carefully rescued. Many a heart that, through lack of enlightenment, still clung to the ancient faith, felt itself outraged and cut to the quick by these scenes. "They could have wept tears of blood," says Œcolampadius. But all this was but the bitter transition to better things. That purer evangelical conviction which not only takes away, but also bestows, and not only pulls down, but also builds up and establishes, was now to become manifest in fairer and more enduring works. The labours of Œcolampadius and his associates were not to be submerged in the passionate movements of an excited populace. The spirit of repose and order, the spirit of moderation and discipline, was to return, and with it the blessing of reform was to be diffused over city and country.

When the first violence of the storm had subsided, the federal envoys from Zurich, Bern, Solothurn, and Schaffhausen made their appearance, and deputies also arrived from the cities of Constance and Mühlhausen. The measures adopted by the Government in regard to the images and the mass were confirmed and enforced through the mediation of these

[1] See the letter of Œcolampadius, Ochs, vol. v. p. 659.

ambassadors, a general amnesty was proclaimed, and all were admonished to refrain from reproachful comments on the recent disturbances.

A smooth way was now speedily made for the chariot of reform, and all requisite measures were taken to usher it in with due legality.

On Saturday the 15th of February, several councillors were commissioned to attend the federal envoys to the halls of the different guilds, for the purpose of informing the burghers of the treaty of peace, and receiving from them the oath of fidelity and obedience. All went on with the greatest tranquillity. Some opposition, in reference to the images, was met with in Little Basel, but was speedily quelled.[1] Important changes among the incumbents of offices in the Church and University followed in the train of the Reformation. The place of the Suffragan-Bishop Marius was again occupied by Telamonius Limperger, a man of evangelical sentiments. By order of the council he preached for a short time at the minster, until Œcolampadius was appointed cathedral preacher. The latter had, previous to this, practically discharged the functions of an *antistes* (a prelate in the Reformed Church). It was not, however, until later that such an office was regularly constituted and handed down to successors. The power of the Catholic bishop was a thing of the past. The pious but aged and infirm Christopher von Utenheim had died at Delsberg in 1527. His successor, Philip von Gundelsheim, retired to Pruntrut, and the cathedral chapter removed to Freiburg, in Breisgau, whence in later years it returned to the neighbourhood of Basel and settled in Arlesheim. A large proportion of the cloister clergy were scattered in like manner.

Basel lost at this time others, also, who stood in the foremost ranks of learning, and who had been distinguished for the moderation of their sentiments; among these were Dr. Ber, Glareanus (Loriti), and Erasmus. It was with reluctance that Erasmus quitted a city that had become a second home to him,

[1] Comp. Ochs, vol. v. p. 569.

and a friend to whom he was so tenderly attached as Boniface Amerbach. By the latter he was escorted to the Rhine, where he embarked for Freiburg. In the following elegiac stanza he gave involuntary expression to his feelings at departing[1]:—

"Nun lebe wohl, O Basel! die weit vor anderen Städten
Mir ein gastliches Dach Jahre lang freundlich gewährt.
Heil dir und alles Gute! und dass deinen Mauren doch nimmer
Nahe ein schlimmerer Gast, als dir Erasmus es war."

Erasmus did not like Freiburg as well as the more home-like Basel. In the year 1535, he returned to the latter city, with the intention, however, of travelling farther. But within its walls he was overtaken by death. After passing the winter on a sick-bed (he suffered from his old maladies, the stone and the gout, complicated at last with diarrhœa), he died on the 12th of July 1536, without the rites of the Romish Church, but calling upon the name of Jesus. His tomb may be seen in the minster at Basel. And here let us take a final leave of this man, the subject of so many encomiums, who himself prepared the way for the new time, yet failed to understand God's ways in that time.[2]

[1] "Jam Basilea vale! qua non urbs altera multis
Annis exhibuit gratius hospitium.
Hinc precor omnia laeta tibi, simul illud, Erasmo
Hospes uti ne unquam tristior adveniat!"

[2] As may readily be comprehended, very diverse opinions were entertained concerning Erasmus, both by his contemporaries and by succeeding generations. Violent controversies arose between his admirers and his opponents. Kirchhofer, in his *Life of Farel*, vol. ii. p. 140, relates the following interesting anecdote, touching upon this point (*ex schedis Bibl. Fæsch.*). Farel upon one occasion, when travelling through Basel (about the year 1557), gave vent, as he sat at the public table in the inn of the *Wild Man*, to his indignation against Erasmus, who had then long been dead, and called him (one-sidedly enough) "the worst and most corrupt of mortals." Beza, Farel's companion, chimed in with the latter in his censure of Erasmus, and declared him to have been an Arian, an unbeliever in the merits of Christ. The conversation being reported to Erasmus' friends, Amerbach, Frobenius, and Episcopius, they, not unreasonably, manifested some displeasure thereat and termed the remarks a slander. It is not known in what way Farel defended himself; and it is equally uncertain to what extent the colloquy between Farel and Beza may have been misrepresented by those who repeated it. The friendly relations existing between Erasmus and the Amerbachs are evident, especially from the letters of the former to Boniface Amerbach, on which comp. STOCKMEYER, *Schweizerisches Museum*, ii. pp. 73 sqq.

By the departure of such distinguished men as those whom we have mentioned, the University of Basel unquestionably lost some portion of its brilliancy; yet it cannot be said that the Reformation had an injurious effect upon that institution, if the higher office of a school of learning be taken into consideration. If it be admitted that the true greatness of such an institution depends not solely upon the multitude of illustrious names that it can boast, and the number of its students, but also upon the spirit by which it is animated, the fact is patent that the introduction of the Protestant spirit into the body of this Papal establishment. could have none but a beneficial effect; and though it is true that after the change a certain torpor and rigidity eventually crept over the University again, that circumstance is partially connected with the fact that the spirit of Protestantism as a whole was after a while narrowed and compressed into an unfortunate formalism. Basel, in its Reformed University, continued to be one of the chief nurseries of Reformed theologians, not only for Switzerland, but also for more remote countries. The epoch of an ecclesiastico-political transformation, doubtless, was at first anything but favourable to a quiet pursuit of learning, and fears were entertained in regard to the further subsistence of the University. In view of this condition of affairs we must, with Ochs,[1] look with increased admiration upon the men who, "inauspicious though the times were, nevertheless despaired not of a happy termination to them."

On the 15th of September 1532, the continued existence of the University was assured, and its prerogatives were confirmed. The chairs which had been vacated were soon filled by other celebrated teachers. Simon Grynæus and Sebastian Münster were called from Heidelberg; of these the former was a learned theologian and philologist, and the latter possessed a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, mathematics, cosmography, and history.

Simon Grynæus (Gryner), the progenitor of a learned race,

[1] Vol. vi. p. 62.

was born at Vehringen in Swabia in the year 1493. His parents were simple peasants. He received his education at the town school of Pforzheim, and afterwards visited Vienna and Buda, the Ofen of the present day. At the latter place, the position of rector of the academy was conferred upon him. His humanistic tendencies, however, soon came in conflict with the views of the mendicant friars, and he left Buda and repaired to Wittenberg, where he met with his old school friend Melanchthon. From the year 1524 to the time of his removal to Basel, he occupied the chair of professor of Greek at Heidelberg. At Speier, whither he went for the purpose of attending the Diet in the spring of 1529, he narrowly escaped imprisonment, his preservation from which he regarded as a miraculous one, effected through the agency of an angel. He soon after received his call to Basel, where he already possessed a friend in the person of Œcolampadius. By the side of the latter he laboured for a few years, and then became a witness of his death.

Sebastian Münster, a native of the Palatinate, was also a resident of Heidelberg at the time of his summons to the University of Basel. Other professors at this institution were Paul Phrygio of Schlettstadt, Œcolampadius himself, and, after the death of the latter, Myconius, all of whom imparted instruction in theology. The name of Amerbach threw lustre over the study of jurisprudence; and Albanus Torinus and Oswald Ber distinguished themselves in the department of therapeutics.

We cannot on this occasion refrain from adverting to Thomas Plater, whom we have already frequently mentioned in the course of this history, and who was a perfect original in his way. A native of Gräuchen in the Valais, Thömeli followed the calling of a poor shepherd boy, and passed through some of the strangest adventures while he was still in his youth.[1] After many wanderings, the account of which forms a notable

[1] Comp. the oft-quoted description of FRANZ; also FECHTER, *Geschichte des Schulwesens in Basel.*

contribution to the history of the manners of that time, the merry youth became amanuensis to Myconius at Zurich; he next learned the trade of ropemaking with Collin, the accomplished linguist, and afterwards entered the service of a certain G. Stäheli at Basel, a man who passed for the roughest master on all the Rhine. Not only did Plater, while at work, secretly peruse his Latin books, which he cunningly fastened to his bundle of hemp, but he even delivered lectures on the Hebrew language in his journeyman's apron. In the pursuit of learning, he was assisted more particularly by Oporinus (Herbst), who, after having been a printer, became, soon after the Reformation, the first rector of the school at Burg, — *i.e.* the Gymnasium. He was succeeded in this office by Thomas Plater, who had also for a time been printer and schoolmaster by turns. Plater entered upon the rectorate in 1541; he then bought the estate of Gundeldingen for six hundred and sixty florins, and practised agriculture in addition to teaching.

The excessive many-sidedness of Plater's mind prevented him from ever becoming a persevering and sterling worker in any particular line; though a man who, while struggling against a thousand difficulties, is constantly reaching after some new and original attainment, offers much that is attractive to the observer. The more thorough, perhaps, for the desultoriness of the father, were ultimately the labours of the son in the cause of science: Felix Plater, who was born in the year 1536, richly merited the favour of his native city, and especially of the University, by his labours as city physician and professor of medicine at Basel.

But let us turn once more to the year 1529, which, as has been already stated, was a time not only of ecclesiastical, but also of manifold political reforms.

It is true that previous to this, in 1516, the constitution of Basel had received a more liberal moulding; still further alterations, however, were now set on foot in the interest of the burghers, a circumstantial account of which would be out

of place in this work. Suffice it to say that the suffrage rights of the guilds were increased, the power of the Great Council was extended, and as effectual a check as possible was put upon the evils attendant on nepotism. A number of the burghers had left the city during the disturbances. Most of these now returned, and were received back as citizens upon taking the civic oath. This interchange of oaths on the part of the burghers and the Government took place on the 14th of February 1529.

More important for us are the further steps that were taken for the introduction and establishment of the ecclesiastical reform.

On the 1st of April 1529, the first mandate of reform appeared, which must be regarded as the foundation of all subsequent mandates relative to reform in ecclesiastical matters and in morals, and as the basis of the matrimonial statutes, etc., issued at a later period. This mandate set forth in outline those articles of faith which, a few years later (in 1534), were submitted for approval to laymen and ministers of the word in the *Confession of Basel.* The articles of faith were followed by salutary moral regulations, which sufficiently demonstrate that the Reformation contemplated an abolition not simply of ecclesiastical ceremonies, but also of moral abuses—not a mere change of dogmas, but a thorough amendment of life in all classes.[1] In order to give weight to this mandate, the so-called *Ban* was instituted, in 1530, through the influence of Œcolampadius and the mediation of the clergy of the other evangelical cantons, who were convened at Aarau for the purpose. By this arrangement it was provided that in every parish church three men of integrity, courage, and piety, should be appointed, who in connection with the local priests—*i.e.*, the pastors and deacons—should

[1] Here, as elsewhere, an important distinction between *reformations* and *revolutions* forces itself upon our view; whilst the latter, as a general thing, are promoters of frivolity in public morals, increasing, for instance, the number of tavern licences, relaxing the observance of the Sabbath, etc., the former are accompanied by a dignified sedateness, or even, it may be, a censorious rigour.

exercise a faithful and earnest superintendence over their fellow-parishioners. Of these three, two were to be chosen from the council, and the other from the congregation. Four such Bans were instituted, the whole city having, after the superfluous churches were suppressed, been divided into four parishes.

Almost simultaneous with the Reformation of Basel, was that of St. Gall and Schaffhausen. The return of Vadianus from the disputation of Bern, where the Evangelicals were victorious, assisted in turning the scale in favour of the Reformation in St. Gall. The transition from Rome to the gospel here, as elsewhere, was not effected without some stormy scenes and the wounding of some consciences, the occupants of the cloisters especially suffering much from acts of violence;[1] as early, however, as the summer of 1528, after the organization of the synod, an orderly condition of affairs was established.

The course of reform at Schaffhausen was less rapid. Since the opponents of the gospel had succeeded in expelling Sebastian Hofmeister and substituting in his stead a man of their own party, Gallus Steiger by name, it was only with great caution that Erasmus Ritter had ventured to defend the Reformers. The behaviour of the council was equivocal. Here, as in Basel, one of the burgomasters (Peyer) was inclined to the Reformation, whilst the other (Ziegler) was averse to it. The former, however, steadily gained adherents and advanced in the confidence of the people; and when, in the autumn of 1529, a body of deputies from the cities of Zurich, Bern, Basel, St. Gall, and Mühlhausen, made their appearance, and demanded an audience before both the councils, they received the joyful reply that "burgomasters and councils were unanimous in desiring to abolish the mass and the images, together with all other erroneous rites connected with the service of God, at the earliest possible moment." Under the superintendence of members of the

[1] Comp. HOTTINGER, *Forts. von Joh. v. Müller*, vii. pp. 119 sqq.

council, the images were at once removed from the churches in an orderly manner. A settlement was made with the cloisters; and Erasmus might have uttered his sarcastic comment on this occasion also, since the drama was terminated by a double wedding. The Abbot of All Saints married a nun of Töss, and his sister became the wife of Erasmus Ritter.

In some portions of Switzerland—as, for instance, in Glarus—the two religious parties subsisted side by side. Thus, Valentine Tschudi, the priest and historian of Glarus,[1] in connection with his like-minded assistant, Jacob Heer, thought it best to deliver an evangelical sermon in one of the parishes under his charge, and to celebrate mass in the other, with a view to being, as far as possible, all things to all men. The conduct of Tschudi in this respect has been variously criticised, some having regarded it as indicative of lukewarmness, whilst others profess to discover in it a beautiful instance of that true tolerance which is elevated above party spirit. The better course is to refrain from all precipitate judgment in matters that pertain to the conscience of another, and this especially in a time of difficulty.

So far as the condition of the Helvetic Confederacy in general is concerned, it must be stated that the country was the scene of public hostilities and of the beginnings of a general war of religion at an earlier period than Germany. Libellous writings of the grossest description were issued wholesale, in the authorship of which the vulgar Thomas Murner bore a conspicuous part. Nor did written invective, derisive pictures and abusive names, painted gallows and burning in effigy, suffice; even the scuffles and brawls which frequently took place between the followers of the old and the new faith failed to satisfy the fierce spirit of the times; rude jests began to turn into the bitterest earnest in a far more serious way. When the heated opponents of the

[1] Not to be confounded with the well-known Swiss chronicler, Egidius Tschudi.

Evangelicals could lay hold of a heretic, they made the unfortunate man atone for his heresy with his life. The fate of the hapless cobbler Hottinger, who lost his head after his expulsion from Zurich, has already been related. At Lucerne, Henry Messberg was drowned, because he had uttered some disparaging remarks against monks and nuns; Hans Nagel was burned alive for having been instrumental in spreading the doctrines of Zwingle; and the Anabaptist Hans Krüsi was put to death in the same manner. Most revolting of all, however, was the treatment which James Kaiser, called Schlosser, received from the inhabitants of the canton of Schwytz. Kaiser, who was a native of Uznach, was pastor of Schwerzenbach, in the canton of Zurich, and father of a family. Having recently been elected pastor of Oberkisch, in the district of Gaster, he occasionally went thither to preach, as it was not yet practicable for him formally to assume the charge of the parish. On one of these apostolic journeys, while passing through a wood near Uznach, he was suddenly attacked, dragged before the cantonal court at Schwytz, and condemned without further ceremony to the stake, where he ended his life after boldly witnessing for the truth. Zurich and Glarus had in vain interceded for the prisoner. They had been repulsed with scorn. Events like this intensified the bitterness of party spirit, and fanned the flame of religious hate.

Two factions now stood opposed to each other in open feud. The five cantons of Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, and Lucerne, to which Freiburg and Solothurn in part allied themselves, formed an offensive and defensive union in favour of the ancient faith, and through the medium of commissioners invited Austria to join their league.[1] The Evangelicals, on the other hand, united themselves in so-called burgh pacts [*Burgrechte*]. The first of these civic compacts was instituted by Zurich with Constance. They were speedily joined by Bern and St. Gall. Basel, whose alliance had been early

[1] On the conferences at Feldkirch and Waldshut, comp. HOTTINGER, *l.c.* pp. 225 sqq., and MÖRIKOFER, ii. pp. 132 sqq.

sought, did not enter the league until the Reformation had gained a complete triumph within its borders; its accession was followed by that of Biel and Mühlhausen. Such separate leagues within the Confederacy were indicative of anything but good. Each side complained that its opponent was guilty of infidelity to the federal cause. Meantime, the attitude assumed by the Confederate Cantons in relation to each other continually became more threatening. In this critical condition of affairs, Zwingle entered upon a course widely different from that pursued by Luther in Germany. While the latter, true to the maxim that differences in matters of faith must be decided by the word of God alone, strenuously opposed the adoption of any violent measure, and upheld the admissibility of self-defence even in a limited sense only; in Switzerland, on the other hand, it was Zwingle who urged the Government and the people of Zurich to an energetic course of procedure, who himself drew up a plan for a battle, and, when the conflict broke out, claimed a place in the ranks of fighting men.

This difference of conduct is explicable in part by the difference in the external circumstances of the two Reformers. Luther regarded a recourse to arms for the defence of the Protestant faith in the light of a rebellion against the emperor and the empire, and drew back with horror at the very idea, because he believed every rebellion against legitimate authority to be at the same time a rebellion against God. Zwingle beheld in the Burgher War, caused by religious disagreement, a misfortune for the country—serious, indeed, yet unavoidable. It was no rebellion in his sight, however; for although the Reformed were accused of violating the Helvetic League, this accusation might with no less propriety be thrust back upon those who sought the help of Austria. And had not the foreign alliance, the pensions, the mercenary service, which Zwingle had so zealously opposed, long been adverse to the original idea of the Confederacy—nay, were they not rather treason to the Fatherland? The Reformed

cantons of Switzerland, as members of a republic, occupied a different relation toward the Confederacy from that sustained by the Electorate of Saxony toward the German Empire and the emperor.

And yet it almost seems to me as if, had the circumstances of Zwingle and Luther been reversed, the former would still, in accordance with his whole mental bent, have been hastier in resorting to external remedies than Luther. Had *he* been in Luther's place in Germany, Landgrave Philip of Hesse would assuredly not have met with the same opposition from him as from the Saxon Reformer; while the latter, even amidst the difficulties in which Switzerland was placed, might perhaps have withdrawn his hand from the sword, and tried once more to await the effect that the word of God and prayer might produce in a divinely-ordained time of trouble. Not that Zwingle is therefore open to the reproach of having put his trust in an arm of flesh, or Luther chargeable with cowardice. Each acted in accordance with his own convictions, and in the manner suggested by "that singing-master in the heart" of whom we have heard before. Zwingle, at this juncture, as on other occasions, exemplifies that practical *energy*, combined with judicious calculation, which incites to immediate action, and, in the exercise of trust in God, assumes all responsibility for that which it deems itself able in its own strength to perform, when, upborne by a sense of right and by moral enthusiasm, it is drawn into a *visible* conflict. In Luther's character, on the other hand, beams forth a *faith* which is mighty in stillness; which unhesitatingly submits to the incomprehensible orderings of God; which, in guiltless suffering, in patient bearing of the cross, in conflict against an *invisible* world of evil spirits, and amid a thousand temptations, aspires unceasingly towards one great aim, set high above all calculations of the human understanding, and possessed of import for him alone who as a martyr is able to live and die for the heavenly riches.

To rush upon the field of battle for the cause of the Lord

seemed presumption to Luther, whilst he would cheerfully have gone to the stake with a Huss, or have suffered himself to be nailed to the cross with his Master. Since Zwingle, however, would have been equally loath to draw back from such a martyr's death, his appeal to the sword may be judged, I believe, from a higher point of view than that usually occupied. His interest in politics was stronger than that of Luther, and in his twofold attitude as a warrior for God and his country, he reminds us of Joshua and Gideon of old, at the same time that we are constrained to admit that the mode of warfare prescribed in the economy of the New Covenant is totally different from that which was called for under the Old Dispensation.

Zwingle, be it understood, believed that war afforded the only means of rescuing his country from her ignominious condition. "That peace," he wrote to his warning friends at Bern,[1] "which many are still advocating so strongly, is war; the war that I desire is peace. There is no longer any security possible for the truth, or those who revere it, unless the foundation pillars of tyranny are overturned. Do not lose confidence in me because I feel compelled to speak thus; with God's help I will continue worthy of your trust." It must needs awaken feelings of regret within us when we see him—a messenger of peace, a minister of the gospel—still insisting upon war at a time when all others were eager for peace. Since, however, almost every vigorous character exhibits some hard rock of offence, to overstep which all efforts are fruitless,—since Luther has shown us a sharp angle of this kind in the eucharistic controversy, why should we not tolerate in Zwingle a harshness which, it may be, was indispensable in circumstances with which we are insufficiently acquainted? Those who in troublous times are advocates of peace, are not always true friends of their country; and even admitting that they were, none the less are *they* friends who, not through lust of fighting, but from an earnest and manly

[1] Comp. HOTTINGER, *l.c.* p. 244.

conviction, press for war. Even a minister of the gospel—and especially one who holds not his own person back from the conflict—may recommend measures of apparent severity to clear his conscience from the reproach of a base fear of man. Whether such severity, such extreme measures, were necessary at the period which we are discussing, I will not venture to decide. The result, indeed, has shown that the cause of the gospel was in no way benefited thereby. External consequences, however, are not always infallible guides to a right judgment. And supposing even that Zwingle erred in his choice of means, far be it from us to test the intentions of the man by his conduct's result, that result being shaped by the hand of God alone.

But we will not anticipate the course of our history. Let us examine into the progress of affairs.

The unjust capture and cruel execution of Kaiser had first excited general indignation against the five cantons. Disputes relative to the Abbot of St. Gall, etc., intensified the feeling of animosity. Hostilities began by a cutting off supplies on either side, and both parties finally took up arms. Zurich was foremost in manifesting a disposition for war; Bremgarten and Muri were occupied, and troops were stationed in the district of Gaster and the valley of the Rhine. Bern, though indignant at the people of Unterwalden, who had succoured the rebellious Ober-Haslithalers, endeavoured to mediate a peace; on seeing the preparations of the opposite side, however, this canton, like Basel, St. Gall, and Mühlhausen, also contributed its auxiliaries to the Evangelical troops. The five cantons meantime had not been inactive. While Schwytz, Uri, and Unterwalden drew themselves up at the foot of the Brunig mountains against Bern, the banner of Lucerne was borne, under the leadership of Magistrate Hug, against Muri. Kappel had been chosen as the headquarters of the Zurichers, whose army Zwingle accompanied not simply in the capacity of chaplain, as Bullinger states, and as is generally believed on his authority, but as an armed combatant. Commander Schmid of Küss-

nacht, more peaceably disposed than Zwingle, was chaplain. A contemporary chronicle by Bernard Weiss says:[1] "Master Conrad Schmid was appointed to preach to the troops while in the field, for it was not desired that Master Ulrich Zwingle should go to the war, as he had many bitter enemies on the opposing side; he would not stay at home, however, but mounted a horse and bore a fine halberd on his shoulder."[2] The rival forces might have numbered collectively about 30,000 men had all of both sides been present; without waiting, however, for the accession of the still absent troops, Zurich sent a trumpeter to proclaim to the five cantons the rupture of the federal alliance. The vanguard of the Evangelical army was already in marching order, though the frontier had not yet been crossed, when there came up from Baar, Landamman Aebli of Glarus, a man who was universally esteemed, and who, being possessed of the ancient Helvetic spirit, was averse to the system of foreign pensions. With unfeigned and deep emotion, the newcomer advocated peace. Excellent, he declared, were the equipments of the warriors on both sides, but might not a peace still be possible between those who had so often hazarded their lives side by side? "Worthy and beloved gentlemen of Zurich, for God's sake avert the dissolution, the downfall, of the old Confederacy!"

It having been resolved to defer the attack and procure fresh orders, Zwingle severely reproached the Landamman. "Gossip Amman," said he, "thou wilt have to render a reckoning to God for this mediation. Whilst our enemies are in a sack and unarmed, they are lavish of good words, and thou believest them. But when they are armed they will have no mercy on us." But Aebli calmly answered, "Dear Ulrich, I trust in God that all will yet be well." Steps were now actually taken to secure peace, Aarau being appointed as the

[1] HOTTINGER, *l.c.* p. 251, note 34.

[2] Thomas Plater, among others, describes this expedition as an eye-witness. He served his master, Stähelin, on that occasion in the capacity of squire, and carried his armour for him, but from that time withdrew from his old relation to his master and the ropemaking trade.

meeting-place of the two parties. Zwingle shook his head at this arrangement. "For God's sake, gracious lords," he wrote to Zurich, "do not suffer yourselves to be moved, even by tears! Upon your manly resolution, all our future weal depends."

Intense as was the feeling of exasperation on both sides, some remnants of the old cordiality still survived among the people, and evidenced themselves upon occasion in a striking manner.

Both parties were strictly forbidden to cross the frontier during the continuance of the truce. The outposts, however, frequently met and engaged in neighbourly converse and good-humoured raillery. Upon one occasion some of the men of the five cantons placed a great bowl full of milk on the boundary line, and called to the Zurichers that they had milk but nothing to break in it. Immediately "some honest fellows" of Zurich ran and crumbled some bread in the milk. Then every man threw himself down on his own ground, and all ate together from the common dish. If one chanced to reach over the middle of the bowl, another would playfully rap him over the knuckles with his spoon and admonish him not to cross the frontier. Such true-hearted pleasantry on the part of individuals in the midst of the white heat of passion which dominated the mass, was so affecting a sight to the stranger spectator, that Jacob Sturm, governor of Strassburg and one of the umpires, beautifully exclaimed, "You Swiss are a wonderful people! Even when you are at variance, you are still one, and your ancient friendship is never forgotten!"

The commissioners now entered upon the business of mediation at Aarau, but subsequently removed to Steinhausen, in the canton of Zug, for the purpose of being nearer to both parties. A peace [1] was effected on the 26th of July 1529.

[1] See the documents relating to this peace as presented in FESSLER AND HOTTINGER'S *Archiv für schweizerische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, Zurich, 1827, one vol.

The free preaching of the gospel, the dissolution of the alliance with Ferdinand of Austria, the abolition of the pensions, and the cessation of insult on both sides, formed the main stipulations of the treaty. Bern, which had with great unwillingness been prevailed upon to join in the war, did not conceal its delight at the peace which had been brought about. Zurich also, however, gave orders for festivities at the different guild-halls, and further celebrated the occasion by a discharge of cannon at the Lindenhof.[1] A general jubilation seemed to have taken the place of the war cry. But amid all these rejoicings, Zwingle went about with serious mien, casting gloomy glances into the future. He gave expression to his feelings in the following hymn :—

" Herr, nun heb' den Wagen selb !
Schelb (schief) wird sust
All unser fart.
Das brächt Lust
Dem Widerpart,
Die dich
Verachtn so frefenlich.

" Gott, erhö den Namen din
In der straf
Der bösen Böck !
Dine Schaf
Widrum erweck,
Die dich
Liebhabend inniglich.

" Hilf, dass alle Bitterkeit
Scheide fer (fern),
Und alte trüv
Widerkeer,
Und werde nüv :
Dass wir
Ewig lobsingend dir." [2]

Unpleasant though it may have been to him to take the position of a prophet of ill, he could not refrain from giving vent to his apprehensions in the pulpit, declaring that he feared " the peace would sooner or later cause men to wring their hands." It was, indeed, of no long duration, and Zwingle

[1] See Thomas Plater's description of the proceedings.

[2] [" Do Thou direct Thy chariot, Lord,
And guide it at Thy will ;
Without Thy aid our strength is vain,
And useless all our skill.
Look down upon Thy saints brought low,
And prostrate laid before the foe.

" Beloved Pastor, who hast saved
Our souls from death and sin,
Uplift Thy voice, awake Thy sheep,
That slumbering lie within
Thy fold, and curb with Thy right hand
The rage of Satan's furious band.

" Send down Thy peace, and banish strife,
Let bitterness depart ;
Revive the spirit of the past
In every Switzer's heart :
Then shall Thy Church for ever sing
The praises of her heavenly King."

—From D'AUBIGNÉ'S *Hist. of the Ref.* (William Collins, Glasgow and London), vol. iv. p. 317. It is to this edition of M. D'Aubigné's work that reference is most frequently made in the present volume.—TR.]

himself became the sacrifice of his own zeal. But before narrating the fresh outbreak and sad ending of the Switzer War, let us contemplate a conflict of another nature, which was unsuccessfully seeking its adjustment at almost this very time.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY RESUMED — CONFERENCE OF MARBURG AND ITS RESULTS—FRANCIS LAMBERT—PHILIP OF HESSE—CONGRESS OF SCHMALKALDEN—THE SCHWABACH-TORGAU ARTICLES — CONVOCATION OF THE DIET OF AUGSBURG—LUTHER AT COBURG—MERCURIUS GATTINARA.

AFTER having separately considered the two currents of the German and the Swiss Reformation, from the time of the Peasant War to the first War of Cappel, we have arrived at a point where these two currents meet—not, however, to unite and flow peacefully on together with doubled power, but, after mingling their tides for an instant in wild commotion, again to divide and pursue their respective ways in separate channels.

Before surveying the disputants as they stand ranged against each other at the conference of Marburg, it will be necessary for us to resume our narrative of those controversial publications whose beginnings we have already considered.

We concluded our account of the eucharistic controversy, in chapter xv., with Œcolampadius' friendly admonition to Luther to strive after a more moderate and dignified tone. This advice was, however, unheeded. On the contrary, Luther now issued one of his most violent publications, under the following title: *That the Words, "This is my Body," still hold good*, etc.

Zwingle had carefully refrained from attacking that "very learned man, Martin Luther," but had, in general terms, expressed his disapprobation of the passionate tone which

had characterised the controversy from its commencement.[1] Luther thereupon issued his tractate *Against the Fanatics*,[2] in which he deports himself like a "raving Orestes," as Capito calls him. That "master of a thousand wiles" [*Tausendkünstler*], the devil, comes in, as usual, for a share of the writer's reprobation, the Reformer charging him with having produced the present disturbance in the Church. Luther professes to give up all hope of converting Zwingle and his adherents, and declares that their sin is too heinous to be forgiven. Christ Himself, he says, did not convert a single high priest. He, however, undertakes the present refutation for the sake of the weak and simple. He begs to be excused from listening to all further recommendations of brotherly love. Such love as had been frequently enjoined upon him was, he declared, an accursed love. To his mind it was suggestive of the case of one who should first murder the father, mother, wife, and child of another, and then say, "Be at peace, dear friends; let us love one another; it is no such great affair as to cause us to disagree." It was thus, he said, that the fanatics [*Schwarmgeister*] had treated him; they had slain God his Father in His words, and had, moreover, murdered his mother, Christianity, and his brethren, and now they desired that there should be love between him and them! It is saddening to observe the lengths to which Luther suffered himself to be carried by passion; earnest-minded though he was, he did not shrink from the greatest irreverence in seeking to throw ridicule upon his opponent's interpretation of Scripture. Zwingle's assumption that *is* is equivalent to *signifies*, Luther declares to be as arbitrary as "if I [Luther] were to deny that God created heaven and earth, and, when some one came to me and held up before my eyes the words of Moses, 'In the beginning God created

[1] On Zwingle's minor writings, such as his communication to the canon Jacob Ulibach (1526), comp. MÖRIKOFER, ii. p. 201.

[2] *Dass die Worte Christi: "Das ist mein Leib," w. s. w. noch feststehen. Wider die Schwarmgeister.*

heaven and earth,' I were to explain the text in this wise: 'God' is equivalent to 'cuckoo,' 'created' means 'ate,' 'heaven and earth' means 'the sparrow, feathers and all;' so that the words of Moses would run thus: 'In the beginning the cuckoo ate the sparrow, feathers and all.'" That, says Luther, would be a fine way to treat the Holy Scriptures.

Zwingle had taught that the body of Christ could not be in the bread of the Eucharist, because that body is in heaven, at the right hand of God. Luther, accordingly, accused Zwingle of conceiving of heaven "as such a place as we tell children it is,—with a golden throne in it, and Christ sitting by the Father in a chorister's gown, with a golden crown on His head,—as the painters depict heaven." Luther conceived of the "right hand of God" as everywhere,—in every leaf of every tree,—and from this he argued the ubiquity of Christ's body. He, however, denied the accusation that he maintained the *local* presence of Christ's body in the bread: "We poor sinners are not quite so foolish as to believe that the body of Christ is in the bread in the gross and palpable way in which bread is in a basket, or wine in a goblet, as the fanatics affirm of us, delighting themselves in our folly; but we believe without more ado that His body is where His own words place it: 'This is my body.' The fathers and we say sometimes that Christ's body is *in* the bread simply because His body is there; but we care not whether a man say 'it is *in* the bread,' or 'it is *the* bread,' or 'it is where the bread is,' or however else he chooses; we will not dispute about words (?). God has more ways of having one thing in another than the gross way in which bread is in a box, wine is in a cask, or money is in the pocket. Levi was in the loins of Abraham; light and colour and all that we see are said to be in our eyes, and thus even heaven and earth may be in the eye. In the same manner, trees and fruits are in their respective germs and seeds." It will be seen that Luther here leaps from rigid realism into spiritualizing idealism, but immediately after this he intrenched himself

once more in the former. Zwingle had referred to Christ's saying that "it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Luther replied that it was not the place of reason to investigate as to what things are profitable or the contrary. He maintained, indeed, that there was great profit in the doctrine which he defended, for the very reason that it is an offence to reason, and a preventive against its haughty self-exaltation.

Zwingle replied to this writing of Luther's in another publication.[1] In antithesis to Luther, who opened his tractate with the devil, Zwingle thought that he could commence more worthily by wishing Luther prosperity and salvation through Christ, in order that his opponent might perceive that Christ dwelt in the heart of each of them by faith, and not by eating. He expressed his confidence that God's word would at last prevail, to the exclusion of such terms as "fanatic, devil, knave, heretic, murderer, rioter, dissembler, and hypocrite, —*trotz, botz, blotz, blitz, dunder, po, pu, pa, plump*,—and the like abusive and opprobrious words." Luther's stinging declaration that Christ never converted a high priest, he returns upon its author, with the advice to seek for the high priest in his own bosom; for, said he, "we are all of us but poor, untaught, doltish, petty enthusiasts." The sober-minded critic strove to meet his angry opponent with cool irony, though involuntarily Zwingle's own blood boiled. The first ebullition of passion being over, however, he went calmly and thoroughly to work. The controversy respected not only the Eucharist, but also the person of Christ—the relation of the two natures, the divine and the human, to each other. Zwingle admitted the presence, in the Scriptures, of certain passages that affirm somewhat concerning the divine nature which,

[1] *Dass diese Worte Jesu Christi: "Das is myn lychnam, der für üch hingegeben wird," ewiglich den alten einigen Sinn haben werdend, und M. Luther mit sinem letzten Buch sinen und des Papstes* (!). *Sinn mit gelehrt und bewährt hat; Huldrychen Zwingli's christliche Antwurt*, Zurich, Froschauer, 1527. The book has a preface addressed to the Elector John of Saxony (*Deutsche Schriften*, vol. iii. p. 16 sqq.).

taken strictly, is applicable to the human nature also, and *vice versa*. This he called a change ["*Abtauschung*" *oder* "*Gegenwechsel*"] of natures (ἀλλοίωσις). After expatiating at some length upon this point, he closes with these words: "Herewith, dear Luther, I submit to you my humble request that you will no longer rage in this matter as you have done hitherto, for if *you* are Christ's, *we* also are His. It is not seemly that we should employ against each other any other weapon than the word of God. Use that therefore with Christian discretion, and we will do the same. May the truth be victorious. Amen."

But Luther continued to rage. In the year 1528, his *Bekenntniss von Abendmahl Christi* appeared. This work, which is also called the *Great Confession*, bears for its motto the following words: "Preserve me in integrity and uprightness" ([*Schlecht und recht behüte mich*], Ps. xxv. 21). The tractate is powerfully written, though characterised, like everything adverse to Zwingle that flowed from the pen of Luther, by excessive vehemence of diction and a certain self-exaltation. The remarks on the use of the trope, in Scripture as well as in ordinary discourse, are not lacking in ingenuity. Well-chosen examples demonstrate the loss of force which in many cases would follow the interpretation of *is* by *signifies*. Thus, for instance, John the Baptist *is* Elijah, means more than he *signifies* Elijah; it could better be said inversely, Elijah signifies John. The lower is significant of the higher, not the converse. Christ *is* the Vine (the vine, however, can be said to *signify* Christ). That which Zwingle and Œcolampadius called a trope, Luther designated as a "word-renewal," a raising of the word into a new sense. When Christ is called a Flower, the meaning is not simply that He *signifies* a flower: He *is* in very deed a flower (as we would say the flower of mankind), though He is such in a higher sense than the flower of the field.[1]

[1] Some of the examples cited by Luther are of a more ignoble sort. When, he remarks, in speaking of a miser, we say he *is* a cur, we do not mean that he

Christ's words, Luther continues, are not mere *signs* [*Deutelworte*]; they are *deeds* and *commands* [*Thätelworte und Heisselworte*].

It was with special violence that Luther attacked Zwingle's doctrine concerning the two natures in Christ, his teaching in regard to what he styled the "Alloiosis" [ἀλλοίωσις]. Luther called this doctrine a devilish disguise, against which all should be on their guard; for, says he, it represents Christ to us as having done no more, with all His life and suffering, than any mere saint. That "old storm-raiser" Madam Reason, he continues, is the "grandmother of Alloiosis," for she says "Divinity cannot suffer and die." In reality, however, Luther, like Zwingle, assumed that statements are frequently made concerning a whole, which when taken strictly are applicable only to a part.[1] He contended, however, that this form of speech, as well when employed in relation to the personality of Christ as in other instances of its use, should not be termed "alloiosis," but "synecdoche." In no instance did Luther swerve one hair's-breadth from his doctrine in regard to the ubiquity of the body of Christ. God, he declares, has many ways of being in a place.[2] It is not admissible, Luther proceeds, arbitrarily to strip the Divinity of its humanity. God does not don and doff humanity "as a peasant puts on or lays aside his coat." "Therefore" (he thus addresses Zwingle) "away with thee, thou gross fanatic, with thy dronish thoughts! If thou art capable of no better ideas on such a subject, go sit by the stove and roast apples and pears, and leave this matter in peace." Towards the end of the book Luther utters a complete confession of faith, full of deep religious feeling, and declares his intention to abide by

signifies a cur; he *is*, in fact, a cur—a cur in his ways, he has the nature of a cur. Thus it may also be said Luther *is* a second Huss, Zwingle *is* another Korah, Œcolampadius *is* a new Abiram. (Here Luther's modesty deserted him.)

[1] Thus we say, "The king's son is wounded," when we mean that a leg of the king's son is wounded; or, "Peter is grey," when only his hair is grey.

[2] Luther affirms the same thing of the devil. The latter, he says, can be in a whole city, or he can be in a tankard, in a box, or in a nut-shell. And again, a whole legion of devils may be in a man.

111687

this confession to his dying day. If, he remarked, he should ever, in the pangs of death, alter it, such alteration might be regarded as invalid, and instigated by the devil. "So help me my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

This powerful controversial publication of Luther called forth the combined opposition of Zwingle and Œcolampadius.[1] Zwingle, who until this time had always treated Luther with great respect, responded at last to the harsh language of the Saxon Reformer with asperities of his own. He tells him he (Luther) is sick with a "word fever;" he accuses him of falling back upon indefinite and obscure expressions, and says that Luther would fain "envelop himself in the smoke of his own violence, and thus make his escape from argument." "In reading this book," he continues, "I feel as I should do if I saw a sow in my flower garden, so foully and untheologically does the man speak of God and sacred things." Luther, he observes, commenced one of his books with the devil, and has ended another in the same way.[2] "Thus it is that God decrees that when we would be wise without His word, we become fools."

We have been thus circumstantial in our account of this unedifying controversy, for the reason that it is highly characteristic both of the two men who were principally engaged in it, and of the age in which they lived. The narrative will also serve to make manifest the difficulty that, after the publication on either side of such productions as the

[1] *Ueber Dr. M. Luthers Buch: Bekenntniss gennant; zwo Antworten Joh. Ecolampadii und Huldrich Zwinglis.* Both works were prepared in great haste. Œcolampadius began his on St. John's day (24th June), and Zwingle's was commenced on the 1st of July 1528. They were issued simultaneously at the time of the autumnal fair, being, "for the sake of brevity and convenience," printed together. They were dedicated to the Elector John of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. In *Zwingli's Werke*, vol. ii. chap. ii. p. 94, may be found his *Answer* alone, without that of Œcolampadius.

[2] Zwingle makes the following remark in reference to the close of Luther's *Confession*: "The most charming thing about the book is that the author concludes the confession of his faith like the parson who, after soundly rating his flock, exclaimed, 'Look you, if you and I do not change our ways, we shall all go to the devil. So help us all, God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'"

foregoing, necessarily attended the work of reconciliation, which, by the arrangement of the Landgrave Philip, was now to be undertaken at the *Conference of Marburg*.[1]

Luther and Melanchthon anticipated from the outset no good results from this conference. They even sought to prevent it from taking place, and Luther declared that he attended it on compulsion. He spoke of the dishonesty (*improbitas*) of the landgrave. Luther had already so accustomed himself to the idea that the Zwinglians formed a distinct party in the Church, as to express the opinion that if *they* were admitted to the conference, the Papists also should be allowed to debate. On the other hand, the council of Zurich was doubtful as to whether Zwingle should be permitted to go to Marburg. Fears were entertained as to his safety, since he would be obliged to travel through a hostile region. But Zwingle was resolved to go. He placed entire confidence in the Landgrave Philip. At the desire of Basel, which was to send Œcolampadius, Bern was also invited to despatch a deputy to the conference; it accordingly sent Berthold Haller. Zwingle left Zurich in company with Rudolph Collin, professor of Greek, and under the escort of a messenger of the council. On taking leave of his wife, he, from a tender desire to spare her anxiety, mentioned only that he was going to Basel. At the latter place he was joined by Œcolampadius, who, like himself, was accompanied by a deputy from the council, Ulric Frei by name. At Strassburg the little band was further augmented by the accession of Bucer, Hedio, and the Burgomaster Jacob Sturm. On the

[1] See SCHMITT, *Das Religionsgespräch in Marburg*, 1840. Sources of information relative to the conference are the reports of eye-witnesses, such, on the side of the Zwinglian party, as COLLIN (*Opp. Zwinglii*, iii. chap. ii. pp. 173 sqq.), ŒCOLAMPADIUS (in a letter to Haller; there is also a manuscript report by Frei, a messenger of the council, in the church archives of Basel); BUCER (in Simler's *Sammlungen*, ii. 2). Comp. BULLINGER, ii. p. 233, and HOSPINIAN, *Historia Sacramentaria ad an.* 1529. On the Lutheran side, MELANCHTHON, JUSTUS JONAS, BRENZ, OSIANDER (*Corp. Ref.* i. pp. 1095 sqq.). Comp. several letters of Luther, especially those from Gerbellius to his wife, to Agricola, and to J. Propst (DE WETTE).

Hunsrück, in the county of Katzenellenbogen, a troop of Hessian horsemen, forty in number, was in waiting to convoy the travellers to their journey's end. Jacob von Taubenheim, the deputy of the landgrave, welcomed the embassy in the name of his master. At St. Goar they were further greeted by the whole body of officials of that place and its vicinity. On the 29th of September they arrived at Marburg, where they met with a friendly reception from the landgrave. The Wittenbergers, consisting of Luther, Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, and Bugenhagen, made their appearance on the following day. Stephen Agricola of Augsburg, Andrew Osiander of Nuremberg, and John Brenz of Schwäbisch-Hall, also visited Marburg on this occasion. As a matter of course, Francis Lambert, the Reformer of Hesse, was not absent. A large number of theologians from far and near resorted to the "Episcopal Synod," as Justus Jonas termed the assembly. Philip displayed the most lavish hospitality, "lodging and entertaining his guests in a right princely manner." In regard to admission to the conference, however, it was necessary to keep within the bounds of moderation, and entrance was denied to Karlstadt, among others.[1] A solemn poetical greeting was extended to the assembly by the learned Enricius Cordus, who admonished the disputants to strive after unity. Sermons were also preached by some of the guests previous to the opening of the conference. Luther delivered a discourse on Christian Righteousness, and Zwingle preached on the subject of Providence.[2]

And now for the conference itself. The landgrave had prudently arranged that the most fiery leaders of the con-

[1] MÖRIKOFER, ii. p. 231.

[2] From this sermon was evolved Zwingle's treatise, *De Providentia Dei* (*Opp. lat.* iv. 2), in which the doctrine of election is discussed. That doctrine did not then constitute a point of difference between the Lutheran and (as it was subsequently denominated) the Reformed system of theology. Nor do we find that Luther objected to the subject-matter of the doctrines; he censured its form simply as too erudite, and charged Zwingle with having unnecessarily introduced into it much Latin, Greek, and Hebrew.

troversy should not immediately come in contact with each other. Private debates were first to take place between Luther and the gentler Œcolampadius, and between Zwingle and Melanchthon. The greater discussion, to which none but princes and men of learning were admitted (ordinary individuals and many of high rank being excluded [1]), took place on the 2d of October, in the great Gothic hall of the castle, in the presence of from fifty to sixty princes, counts, and ambassadors. The conference was opened at the early hour of six in the morning. Chancellor Feige delivered a discourse admonishing the disputants "to strive, by all equitable ways and means, for the speedy ending of this burdensome and most disadvantageous dissension, and for the establishment of a durable union." Before the contested point of the Lord's Supper was touched upon, other articles of faith were discussed. Zwingle and his followers were suspected of entertaining heretical ideas in regard to Christ, original sin, justification, etc. It was necessary that they should first indicate their doctrine in respect of these points, after which the eucharistic disputation commenced. Zwingle and Melanchthon had, in their preliminary debate, come to an agreement in so far as that they had both admitted a spiritual eating of the body of Christ; but upon the question as to whether this spiritual eating is or is not, at the same time, a corporeal eating, they found it impossible to agree. Melanchthon, usually so yielding, was in this instance at least as unbending as Luther. The latter, as is well known, wrote the word ἐστί (*is*) on the table in front of him, and during the course of the argument constantly pointed to it as an irrefutable divine utterance. He demanded an unconditional submission to the authority of this word. If God, he said, should command him to eat crab-apples, he would eat them without asking why. He maintained that Christ's body is in the bread just as the sword is in the scabbard, or as beer is in the tankard (this in opposition to his own former utterances).

[1] According to Bullinger.

When Zwingle protested against this idea, Luther replied, "I will have nothing to do with mathematics," whereupon Zwingle simply answered that he had himself said nothing about mathematics. A singular misunderstanding incensed Luther against Zwingle. The latter, who had brought up the sixth chapter of John in defence of the spiritual partaking of the Lord's Supper, remarked, "That passage breaks your neck, doctor." Luther, apprehending the words literally, retorted that they were in Hesse, not in Switzerland, and that his neck was consequently in no danger; upon this, Zwingle hastened to assure him that he had simply made use of a Swiss expression denoting a lost cause. The disputation would have been continued for a longer time had the disputants not been driven away by the outbreak of a malady called the English sweating sickness. The landgrave had spared no pains to reconcile the two parties. The conference having closed on the 3d of October, private interviews took place on the following day. In vain had Zwingle, with tears in his eyes, declared that there were no people on earth with whom he would more gladly be at peace than the Wittenbergers. Luther could not understand this. The idea that it is possible to cherish a brotherly love for persons whose creed is different from our own seemed to him utterly preposterous. In such a case, he thought that neither party could attach much importance to its own belief. He could conceive of no other love towards a doctrinal opponent than that which is due even to a personal enemy. It was in vain that Zwingle offered Luther his hand; the Saxon Reformer put it from him with the words, "You have another spirit."

In order, however, that the conference might not be entirely fruitless, the two parties came to an agreement on the 3d of October in reference to fourteen articles, none of which had any bearing upon the Lord's Supper.[1] In regard to the

[1] The articles were as follows:—1. The Trinity; 2. Incarnation of Christ; 3. Birth, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ; 4. Original Sin (in

fifteenth article—that relating to the Eucharist—the following was agreed upon :—1. That it should be received in both kinds; 2. That the sacrifice of the mass is inadmissible; 3. That the sacrament of the altar is a *sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ, and that the partaking of it is salutary. "And although," it was further stated, "we are not at this time agreed as to whether the true body and blood of Christ are *physically* present in the bread and wine, we recommend that either party manifest a Christian love to the other (to the extent that the conscience of every man shall permit), and that both parties entreat God Almighty to confirm us by His Spirit in the right doctrine. Amen." These articles were signed on the 4th of October by the theologians of both sides.[1] The assembly dispersed. Zwingle, after an absence of more than six weeks, returned to Zurich. Though the conference had not been productive of the desired result, it was not altogether fruitless. Francis Lambert, who had hitherto been of the Lutheran persuasion, was from that time a decided adherent of Zwingle. From his deathbed, upon which he was soon after laid, he wrote [February 1530] to his friends in Strassburg on the subject, and desired that his letter might be published, in order that the whole world might know that he had changed his opinion in regard to the Lord's Supper. He declares, concerning his personal relation to the controversy, that he had, from the very commencement of the latter, besought God to deliver him from the maze of opinions in which he was entangled; that he had conscientiously examined the antagonistic views; and though he had at first been of Luther's opinion, he had never brought himself to regard the opposite party as delivered

regard to which, however, Zwingle entertained a different opinion from Luther's); 5. Redemption; 6 and 7. Justification by Faith; 8. Operation of the Holy Ghost through the Written Word and the Sacraments; 9. Baptism; 10. Good Works as the Fruit of Faith; 11. Confession and Absolution; 12. Civil Authority; 13. Tradition; 14. Necessity of Infant Baptism. See HERR, *Die 15 Marburger Artikel nach dem Original zur öffentlicht*, Marburg, 1848.

1 Especially by Luther, Melanchthon, Jonas, Osiander, and Brenz, on the one side, and by Œcolampadius, Zwingle, Bucer, and Hedio, on the other.

over to the devil. He had finally resolved that he would never, in his searches for truth, inquire *whose* any particular doctrine was, but rather *what* it was: "Rid thee of all men—ay, cast even Luther from thee, that they may not prove hindrances to thee." Such was his principle. He relates further that he took up his Bible, with a prayer for God's aid, and examined the controverted question as though he had never read a word concerning it; and in so doing, the sixth chapter of John made a decisive impression on his mind, so that he had arrived at the conviction that a carnal eating of Christ's body profits nothing—Christ's words are spirit and life. Christ is indeed present, in power and effect, in the sacrament of the altar, he continued, but not in a local and corporeal manner.[1]

Of special importance, as a result of the conference, is the fact that the landgrave himself was now won over to Zwingle's way of thinking, and it is probable that nothing save political scruples withheld him from more decidedly embracing the cause of the Swiss Reformer.[2]

The congress of Schmalkalden had been appointed to meet on the 13th of December, but, in consequence of the conference of Marburg, it was held on the 29th of November. Philip exerted himself to the utmost to bring the cities of Ulm and Strassburg into the alliance of the Evangelicals, their admission having been opposed on account of the views entertained by them in regard to the Lord's Supper. The landgrave's efforts were, however, unavailing. The adherents of Luther, on the other hand, clamoured for the universal acceptance of that pure doctrine whose articles, at the suggestion of the Elector of Saxony, were submitted for approval at Schwabach, and afterwards, with but few alterations, adopted at Torgau. But it was not only from doctrinal considerations that Luther

[1] HASSENKAMP, *l.c.*

[2] See MÖRIKOFER, ii. p. 243, for a letter of the landgrave to Zwingle. Luther did all in his power to prevent Philip from forming any connection with the Swiss. Comp. Letter 1216 (DE WETTE, iv.).

scrupled to conclude an alliance to which circumstances might impart a warlike colouring. Luther, who was from principle opposed to anything that bore the slightest resemblance to a revolt against civil authority, as vested in the person of the emperor or elsewhere, declared to the elector that he would rather die ten deaths than have his conscience burdened with the thought that the gospel had been an occasion of any bloodshed or damage. The Evangelicals should be sufferers rather than avengers of themselves; the Christian must bear the cross; prayers and entreaties would accomplish more than defiance.[1] To rise against the emperor seemed to him as contrary to reason and to law as for the burgomaster of Torgau to stir up his people against the elector.

In September of the year 1529 the emperor had gone to Italy to be crowned by the pope. On the 20th of the preceding June he had concluded the Treaty of Barcelona with the pontiff, and in the following August had established the Peace of Cambrai with the King of France, so that he was now at leisure. The Turks alone were disquieting the empire afresh. It being necessary on their account, as well as by reason of the prevalent religious contentions, to hold a Diet, the emperor, writing from Bologna in January 1530, convoked the imperial Estates to meet at Augsburg on the 8th of April. The summons was couched in terms of moderation and gentleness. The meeting was postponed until the 1st of May, and some time elapsed even after that date before the Estates were assembled. Luther desired that much good might result from the deliberations of the Diet. "Let us look to it," he wrote, "that we pray with all diligence and earnestness, and beseech God to let His grace attend upon the present Diet, and to bestow His Holy Spirit with power upon our good and pious Emperor Charles, who is sitting like an innocent lamb (?) in the midst of a multitude of dogs, swine, and devils, to the end that he may establish peace and good order in German lands."

[1] Comp. Luther's Letters (De Wette), 1170, 1191.

The Elector of Saxony repaired to the Diet, followed by a numerous train. The theologians who accompanied him were Luther, Justus Jonas, Spalatin, Melanchthon, and Agricola. During the journey Luther preached at Weimar in Passion Week, and in Coburg at Easter. The elector spent some little time at the latter city, and there he left Luther, not daring to take him with him to Augsburg. He feared that the appearance of this man, from whose head the ban had never been lifted, would create a greater stir among his adversaries at Augsburg than had been excited on a former occasion by his presence at Worms.

Luther's sojourn at Coburg forms, in some measure, a companion piece to his abode in the Wartburg. At Coburg, as at the Wartburg, he dates his letters from "the wilderness," from "the region of birds," or, inverting the letters which compose the name of the town, from "Gruboc." In both places he suffered much from melancholy. Already he began to look about him for a place where his body might repose when the Lord should take his soul to Himself. The supposition that he composed his hymn, *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*, in this time of trial is indeed untenable,[1] but it is certain that he then sought refuge once and again in that firm stronghold of whom the hymn speaks. It is also said that he sang this hymn, which he had previously composed, under his window to the sound of the lute. He would stand for hours at the window, and there it was that he was wont to pray. Matthesius compares him to Moses, who, while the people of Israel fought with the Amalekites; held up his hands to heaven for them in supplication and blessing. Luther prayed at this time after this fashion: "O Father, preserve the framers and professors of the Confession, at Augsburg, in Thy truth: Thy word is truth" [Matthesius]; or, as Vitus Dietrich, his secretary, tells us: "I know that Thou art our dear God and Father; therefore I am certain

[1] According to some authorities, he composed the hymn soon after the Diet of Speier (1529). Comp. Koch, *Geschichte der Kirchenlieder*, iv. p. 215.

that Thou wilt destroy the persecutors of Thy Church; shouldst Thou not do it, Thou wouldst be in like peril with ourselves: the cause is Thine, the enemies of the cross of Christ press upon us; therefore it concerns Thy name and Thy glory to defend the confessors at Augsburg." Here, as in the Wartburg, Luther laboured at his translation of the Bible. In his hours of melancholy he accepted the consolations of John Krug, pastor at Coburg, confessed to him, and from him received absolution, and partook of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at his hands. His poetical vein was also active here, showing itself sometimes in profound reflections, and at other times in witty comparisons. Thus, from his window he contemplated the stars in the heavens and "God's whole beautiful vault, that rests upon no pillars and yet abides firm;" or he viewed the course of the clouds, whose burden he likened to an ocean, "and yet saw no bottom for them to rest upon, and no vessels to contain them; yet they did not fall upon us, but greeted us with a sour countenance and fled away. When they had passed, there shone forth that which had restrained them, even the rainbow."[1] Amid his other pursuits, he was occupied with the *Fables of Æsop*, and, inspired by these, merrily fabulized on his own account. Thus he makes the jackdaws, crows, and magpies, which he could watch from his window, hold a Diet, a parody on that of Augsburg.[2] He wrote sentences from the Bible on the door and walls of his room, for his private edification. Now and then he received visitors—as, for instance, Bucer and Urbanus Rhegius. He was continually informed as to all that was going on at Augsburg, and expressed his opinion concerning the proceedings, as is shown by his correspondence. A superfluity of visitors he endeavoured to avoid.[3] It was also in Coburg that he received

[1] Letter to Chancellor Brück, De Wette, iv. No. 1277.

[2] He also dated his letters, *ex comitiis monedularum*. Comp. Letters No. 1201, to Justus Jonas, and No. 1205, to his *Table Companions*, De Wette, vol. iv.

[3] See his letter of 2d June to Melanchthon, De Wette, iv. No. 1219.

the tidings of his father's death, and sought and found consolation therefor in prayer (comp. chap. xvi.).

The Elector John was the first to appear at Augsburg, arriving there on the 2d of May. On the 12th, the Landgrave Philip made his appearance, accompanied by 120 horsemen and his chaplain Erhard Schnepf. The rest of the princes arrived by degrees, and composed, when they were all assembled, the flower of the German nobility. The emperor had been desirous of a private interview with the Elector of Saxony at Insbruck. He communicated his wish to John by the Counts of Nassau and Nuenar; the elector, however, declined the invitation. From Insbruck, the emperor issued a rescript forbidding the Evangelicals to preach during the session of the Diet. But the elector represented to the emperor that the Evangelical party could not do without the word of God; this alone was preached, he declared, and prayer also was offered for the emperor. He likewise reminded Charles of the fact that gospel preaching had been allowed to go on unprohibited during both the Diets of Speier. In the long interval through which the Estates waited for the emperor's coming, all sorts of questions of conscience arose among the Protestants as to the course to be pursued in particular cases—as, for instance, in regard to fasting. It was also queried whether, if the emperor, as was expected, should arrive on the eve of the festival of Corpus Christi, the Protestants should take part in the procession on that occasion. This it was decided not to do.

An event unfavourable for the Protestant party was the death of the imperial chancellor, Mercurius Guttinara. This personage had always exerted himself in behalf of the Protestants, and had possessed the ear of the emperor. Although ill at the time, he had started with the imperial retinue for Augsburg, in the hope of being able to speak a good word for the Evangelicals, but death overtook him at Insbruck on the 4th of June.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE DIET OF AUGSBURG—THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG—CONFUTATION OF THE CONFESSION—APOLOGY FOR THE CONFESSION—CONFESSION OF THE FOUR CITIES—ZWINGLE'S COMMUNICATION TO CHARLES V.—ECK'S REVILINGS AND ZWINGLE'S REPLY—IMPERIAL RECESS—DISSOLUTION OF THE DIET.

ON the 15th of June 1530, Charles v. made his entry with much magnificence into Augsburg. The princes of the empire went in procession to meet him, and alighted from their horses to give him greeting. The Elector of Mentz paid homage to the emperor in a carefully-prepared oration, speaking in the name of all the members of the Holy Roman Empire who were then assembled in Augsburg. After the delivery of this oration, the imperial train moved on in the following order. At the head marched two companies of *Landsknechte*, followed by the mounted tooops of the six Electors of Saxony, the Palatinate, Brandenburg, Cologne, Mentz, and Triers, each body bearing its own particular colour and equipments, and all having on light armour and scarlet jackets; these composed a company of about 450 horse. Next came the retinue of the emperor: first, the pages in yellow and scarlet velvet; then, mounted on superb steeds, came the Spanish, Bohemian, and German nobles, all arrayed in velvet and silk, with gold chains ornamenting their persons, nearly all of them being destitute of armour. These were followed by the trumpeters, drummers, and heralds. After the latter came the dukes, electors, and princes, and immediately following them rode the emperor himself, attired

from head to foot in the Spanish fashion, and mounted on a white Polish hackney. He rode beneath a tricoloured canopy, supported by six councillors of Augsburg. Outside of the canopy rode King Ferdinand and the Papal legate, Lorenzo Campeggio, side by side, followed by the German cardinals and bishops, the foreign ambassadors and prelates, one of the latter, the Bishop of Osma, being the confessor of the emperor. The train of princes and nobles was followed by other companies of horsemen, those of the emperor in yellow uniforms, those of King Ferdinand in scarlet, and vying with these, the mounted troops of the spiritual and secular princes, each again in its peculiar colour, and either in armour and carrying pikes or equipped as sharp-shooters. The rear was brought up by the Augsburg companies of mercenaries and burghers who had that morning proceeded on horseback to receive the emperor. In front of the church of St. Leonard, Charles was greeted by the clergy with the hymn, *Advenisti desiderabilis.* The princes then escorted him to the cathedral, where the *Te Deum* was sung, and a benediction was pronounced on the imperial head. His princely escort left him only after accompanying him to his apartments in the Palatinate [the palace of the Bishop of Augsburg].[1]

Immediately after this solemn entry, the emperor summoned the Evangelical princes, the Elector of Saxony, Margrave George of Brandenburg, Duke Francis of Luneburg, and the Landgrave Philip, to a private interview, and through the medium of his brother [who acted as interpreter] desired them to relinquish the preaching of sermons. The elder princes were silent from perplexity; but the landgrave assumed the

[1] This description is taken from RANKE (vol. iii. pp. 234 sqq.), who derives his account from contemporaneous sources. HÄUSSER (*Zeitalter der Reformation*, p. 135) remarks in reference to this magnificent entry, that the emperor was in general no friend to such display; but, he adds, "on this occasion it was his desire to dazzle men's eyes: friend and foe should be made to feel that he was *the emperor*, in the old sense of the word, the master of the world, the guardian of the Church." On the Diet of Augsburg, comp. FÖRSTEMANN (*Urkundenbuch*, ii., Halle, 1833-35), ROTERMUND (Hanover, 1829), FACIUS (Leipsic, 1830), FIKENSCHER (1830), and others [D'AUBIGNÉ, iv.].

office of spokesman, and replied (as the elector had, in writing, formerly stated) that nothing was preached but the pure word of God. In a further written memorial, the princes referred to the Diet of Nuremberg (1523), in which the preaching of the gospel was expressly sanctioned. They could no more do without preaching, they declared, than they could dispense with daily food for the body; since man, as it is written, does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. They gave the emperor to understand that the interdiction of preaching would give rise to the suspicion that he was about to condemn the cause of the gospel unheard. In order to avoid the semblance of partiality, the emperor finally yielded so far as to prohibit preaching on *both* sides, reserving to himself the right to appoint preachers, and declaring that none save persons so appointed should do more than read the gospels and epistles. This mandate was publicly proclaimed to the sound of the trumpet. The Elector of Saxony expressed himself on the subject, in a letter to Luther, in the following manner: "Our Lord God must hold His peace at the Diet." Luther, however, approved of obedience to the emperor in this matter, and recommended a decent resignation to what was unalterable. In regard to participation in the procession on Corpus Christi day, the thing which the Protestants feared came to pass. The proposal was made that they should join in the procession, but was stedfastly declined by them. It was on this occasion—if not previous to this, during the audience concerning preaching (in which Ranke places the scene)—that Margrave George of Brandenburg fell on his knees before the emperor, and, bending his head to his imperial majesty, assured him that he would rather have it stricken off than do aught against the faith; whereupon the emperor bade him rise, saying, in his Netherlandish dialect, "Dear prince, I will not take your head off" [*Löwer Först, net Kop ab*].

A further question of conscience arose at the opening of

the Diet, on the 20th of June, by a solemn mass in the cathedral. The Protestants thought that they need not scruple to be present on this occasion, as their assistance would be merely passive. They referred to the example of Naaman the Syrian, who was permitted by the prophet Elisha to attend upon the King of Syria in the temple of Rimmon (2 Kings v.). Consequently, the Elector of Saxony and Joachim von Pappenheim alternately held the emperor's sword during the ceremony. From the cathedral the procession repaired to the council hall. Here Frederick the Count Palatine, as imperial minister, opened the Diet with an address, in which he presented the two propositions which were to engage the attention of the assembly, viz.: (1) Redress against the Turks; and (2) The settlement of the religious disputes. It was decided to dispose of the latter subject first. The Protestants were accordingly directed to have their Confession of Faith in readiness to lay before the Diet on the following Friday, the 24th of June. With the preparation of this Melanchthon had been entrusted. He had subjected the articles of faith, as presented at Schwabach, to a thorough revision. Camerarius, his biographer, states that he frequently saw him labouring at this work amid tears and prayers. When the document was completed, he submitted it to Luther for inspection. Luther approved of it in all respects, and remarked, in reference to the tone of mildness which pervaded it, that it was not in *his* power to tread so gently and softly.[1] After all possible pains had thus been expended upon the preparation of the Confession, it was signed not only by theologians, but also by princes and citizens,—by the Elector John of Saxony, Margrave George of Brandenburg, Duke Ernest of Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Prince

[1] Under date of 15th May he writes to the elector as follows: "I have read over Master Philip's *Apology*" (the title originally borne by the Confession); "it pleases me right well. I should not know how to improve or alter it in any respect; nor would it be well for me to attempt it, for I cannot tread so gently and softly. May Christ our Lord cause it to be productive of abundant and precious fruit, as we hope and pray. Amen" (DE WETTE, iv. No. 1213).

Wolfgang of Anhalt, and the imperial cities of Nuremberg and Reutlingen. The example of these cities was followed, during the session of the Diet, by Kempten, Heilbronn, Windsheim, and Weissenburg, and subsequently by several other towns. The chivalrous sentiment with which these signatures were subscribed is apparent from the remarks that accompanied them. When Wolfgang took the pen, preparatory to signing, he said: "I have ridden on many a tilt for the pleasure of others, why should I not, at need, saddle my horse at the behest of my Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ, and for His glory, and, at the risk of earthly life, hasten toward an eternal crown of glory in the heavenly life?"[1] The Elector of Saxony gave expression to similar sentiments. When his theologians declared their readiness to go before the emperor alone if their master felt any hesitation about continuing to support them, the elector made answer: "God forbid that you should shut me out; I also would confess Christ." He declared, furthermore, that his electoral hat and ermine were less valuable in his eyes than the cross of Jesus, seeing that he must needs leave the former behind him when he should depart from this world, whilst the other would accompany him to the stars. From that time John was called the Stedfast, the Confessor. The Confession was read in the episcopal palace of Augsburg, in the chapel of the emperor, on the Saturday following Saint John the Baptist's day (25th June), 1530. Chancellor Brück held the Latin copy of the document, while Chancellor Baier read the German copy aloud. The reading consumed two hours, and commanded the most rapt attention. The chancellor's voice was so distinct, and such silence prevailed in the chapel, that the multitude of people assembled in the courtyard of the palace could understand every word. Many of the listeners were astonished at the excellence of the things which they heard, having received very different accounts concerning the belief, or rather the unbelief, of the Protestants.

[1] See ROTERMUND, *l.c.* p. 75, after SAUBERT, *De Miraculis A. C.* i. p. 378.

Let us examine the Confession a little in detail. This document contained, in the first place, a preface addressed to the emperor, in which it was stated that the present Confession was designed to be the basis of a pacific negotiation. Should this be impracticable, the Protestants, it was further declared, would appeal once more to a free Christian council, which the emperor, in common with the pope, had already promised to convoke. The Confession proper is divided into two parts; the first of these contains the principal articles of faith (*articuli fidei præcipui*) as held by the confessors. These articles are twenty-one in number. In the second part, consisting of seven articles, are presented the abuses which the Evangelicals had taken upon themselves to reform (*articuli, in quibus recensentur abusus mutati*). Part first has therefore more of an apologetical character, while part second is polemical (aggressive) in its bearing. Article first presents the doctrine of the Triune God as previously established by the Church in opposition to heretics, a doctrine in regard to which there was no controversy between the Romanists and the Evangelicals. This article is condemnatory not only of the ancient Arians, but also of the more recent Samosatian heretics, who taught the existence of but one Person in the Godhead, and regarded the "Word" and the "Spirit" as mere rhetorical figures. (In the supporters of this heresy we behold the forerunners of the Unitarians and Anti-Trinitarians of the present day, whose doctrines had already sprung up at this time.) In article second the doctrine of original sin, as taught by St. Augustine and his followers, is defended against the Pelagians. In this article it is taught, that, in consequence of the fall of Adam, man is utterly corrupt, and given over to eternal death, until regenerated by baptism and the Holy Spirit.[1] The third article, "concerning the Son of God," is, like the first, in full accordance with the definitions of the old Œcumenical synods,

[1] This doctrine has even found expression in Lutheran hymns; witness the hymn of Lazarus Spengler, beginning, *Durch Adams Fall ist ganz verderbt menschlich Natur und Wesen.*

and in no point attacks the teachings of the Romish Church; here, also, perfect harmony existed between the two parties, who held in common detestation all who tampered with the doctrine in question. More occasion for controversy is afforded by the fourth article, concerning justification. This, though expressed in terms of great moderation, positively rejects the idea that any merit attaches to good works. The charge of false spirituality which, in consequence of this article, might be fastened upon the Protestants, is warded off in the fifth article, which affirms the necessity for a settled church service, and repudiates the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, who claim the Spirit and reject the word of God. The sixth article, as a guard against the misapprehensive idea that the Evangelical system, in consequence of its doctrine concerning faith, rejects good works, treats "of the new obedience," and represents good works as the *fruit* of faith. In the seventh article the Church is defined as an assembly of saints (*congregatio sanctorum*), in which the gospel is truly taught and the sacraments are duly administered; that an identity of rites should obtain throughout this body cannot, it is claimed, with propriety be demanded. This latter idea is further elaborated in the eighth article. No exception could be taken to the ninth article, concerning baptism. Special reference is had, in this article, to the baptism of infants, and the doctrine of the Anabaptists is expressly condemned. The tenth article, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, was so formulated as to exclude, in terms of positive disapprobation, the view upheld by Zwingle, and every other kindred conception of the ordinance. (We shall return to this later.) In the eleventh article the practice of private confession is sanctioned, but the scrupulous enumeration of every individual sin (as demanded by the Romish institution of oral confession) is declared to be unnecessary, since (Ps. xix. 12) no one knows how frequently he transgresses. In contradistinction to the Scholastic theory of repentance, or penance, that exercise is reduced to the two

factors, true contrition and faith, from which latter good works proceed as fruits of repentance. The idea that absolute perfection is attainable in this life is rejected, as well as the Novatian strictures which refuse to the fallen re-admittance to the communion of the Church. Concerning the use of the sacraments, the thirteenth article declares that the sacraments are not mere signs of confession on the part of man, but signs and testimonials (*testimonia*) of God's gracious will towards us. The doctrine of an external (mechanical) efficacy of the sacraments (*ex opere operato*) is rejected. In harmony with the fifth article, article fourteenth affirms that none but a person who is regularly called (*rite vocatus*) has a right to teach in the Church and to administer the sacraments. According to article fifteenth, only such ecclesiastical usages should be maintained as may be complied with sinlessly and without burden to the conscience. This rule has reference to festival days and the like. The sixteenth article is devoted to political affairs. The Protestants had, especially since the Peasant War, been repeatedly stigmatized as the instigators of revolution. The more necessary was it, on this account, that they should emphatically express their respect for the civil authority, and represent obedience to that as a Christian duty, in antithesis to the Anabaptists, who entertained different ideas on this subject. The second coming of Christ for judgment and for the raising of the dead is taught in the seventeenth article, in accordance with the teachings of the ancient Apostolic Church; the doctrine, as revived by the Anabaptists, of the restoration of all things, and the millennial kingdom (Chiliasm), is condemned. The eighteenth article treats, somewhat in detail, of free-will. As Melanchthon (in his *Loci Communes*) had previously demonstrated, man is indubitably the possessor of free-will to an extent that qualifies him for the fulfilment of civil righteousness [*justitia civilis*], and the performance of such things as fall within the sphere of nature and reason. But he has no power, without the help of the Holy Spirit, to

do that which is righteous in the sight of God. Augustine is thus declared to be correct in opposition to Pelagius. The nineteenth article denies that God is the originator of sin. Good works, previously represented as fruits of faith (articles nine and ten), are further discussed in the twentieth article, in which passages from the Scriptures and the Church fathers are cited. In view of the abuses long prevalent in the Church, and the entanglement of men's consciences consequent upon those abuses, it is declared in this article to be of the utmost importance that justification by faith should be emphatically preached. Article twenty-first recommends a pious remembrance of the saints. They may serve as exemplars for us, this article affirms, but we should not invoke their assistance. "The above," it is remarked at the close of the first part, "is about (*fere*) the sum of our doctrine; and from this it may be seen that we teach nothing that is not in harmony with the Holy Scriptures or the (ancient) Catholic Church."

Part second more particularly discusses the abuses which had crept into the Church, and the abolition of such abuses. In this part seven additional articles treat of participation in the Lord's Supper in both kinds, of the marriage of priests, of the mass and the sacrifice of the mass, of confession, of a distinction of meats, of monastic vows, and of ecclesiastical authority. Remarkable, amongst other things, is the liberal conception of the Christian Sunday, as set forth in this Confession. Sunday is not regarded as a renewal of the Old Testament Sabbath, but as a voluntary, though beneficial, human institution, in the interests of good order.[1]

If we endeavour to bring before our eyes the general condition of the times in which this Confession of Augsburg was drawn up, and look backward upon the conflict which had now lasted for thirteen years,—if we think of all the extraneous and effervescent materials which had infused themselves into

1 [The laxness in the observance of Sunday, which prevails to so great an extent among the Germans, may be in part the result of this too liberal article. —Tr.]

the work of the Reformation, of the wide differences which in process of time had sprung up among the adherents of the new doctrine themselves,—the calm and moderate language of the Confession cannot fail to produce a beneficial impression upon us. In regarding this instrument, we seem to be standing on the borders of a limpid lake, the wild tumult of whose late storm-tossed waters has subsided, and in which the sun, once more issuing from the clouds, is mirrored, though the agitated waves are not yet entirely at rest.

After the reading of the Confession, the German and Latin copies were both handed to the emperor. The German transcript was delivered to the Elector of Mentz, for preservation in the imperial archives, while the Latin copy was sent to Brussels.[1]

The reading of this Confession apparently made a good impression upon a few of the Catholic Estates. This was the case with the Bishop of Augsburg, Christopher Stadion, who showed himself favourably inclined to the Protestants, and who was regarded as a secret Lutheran. Even Duke William of Bavaria, a decided opponent of the Protestants, declared to Eck that until that time he had been falsely instructed in regard to them. Eck asserted that he would be able to confute them with the writings of the fathers, but not with the Holy Scriptures; to which the Duke replied, "I see, sir, the Lutherans are *in* the Scriptures, and we are *near* them." Among the spiritual princes, Stadion was not the only one on whom the Confession produced a favourable impression. Hermann of Cologne also expressed his assent to the doctrines

[1] The original manuscripts seem to be lost. A number of copies were made, however, and translations were sent to all the courts of Europe. The oldest printed edition is that which was prepared at Wittenberg, while the Diet of Augsburg was still in session. It bears the following title: *Confessio fidei exhibita Invictissimo Imperatori Carolo Cæsari Augusto in comitiis Augustæ;* in German: *Anzaigung und Bekanntnus des Glaubens und der Leere, so die Adpellirenden Stände K. Maj. auf jetzigen Tag zu Augsburg überantwortet haben.* Several editions have been issued in modern times, for a notice of which see works on Literature. [See APPLETON'S *New Am. Cyc.* (1858), art. "Augsburg Confession."]

contained therein. The Archbishop of Salzburg felt constrained to confess that he desired an alteration in the mass, the prohibition of meats, and similar ordinances; he was indignant, however, that it was a monk who was endeavouring to reform all such things. On the other hand, the great majority of the Catholic Estates remained unmoved. Some pressed for an immediate execution of the Edict of Worms, maintaining that it should, if necessary, be carried out by force. Others proposed to submit the Confession to impartial judges, whose decision should be referred to the emperor. Others still (and their proposal obtained the majority of votes) desired that a confutation of the Confession should be immediately prepared. The duty of preparing this confutation was devolved upon a committee of Catholic theologians, nineteen in number, the most prominent of whom were Eck, Cochlæus, John Faber, and Conrad Wimpina. By the 12th of July these men had completed their task. The document which they drew up was exceedingly prolix, and, moreover, violent in expression. It was necessary to revise it; but even in its revised form it was by no means a masterpiece. Frederic Myconius says of it, that it was fit neither for boiling nor baking; and Melanchthon wrote to Luther, that of all the wretched productions of their antagonists, the *Confutation* was the most miserable. The revised instrument (the Confutation, like the Confession, was drawn up both in German and Latin) was read in the Diet by the imperial secretary, Alexander Schweiss, on the 3d of August. It was not submitted to the Protestants for examination and confutation; they were simply required to acknowledge their error and return to the Romish Church. This they stedfastly refused to do. The emperor thereupon manifested displeasure, and denied to John of Saxony his formal investiture with the electoral dignity. The Landgrave of Hesse, bitterly offended at the proceedings of the Catholic party, secretly withdrew from the Diet on the 6th of August. No one, however, was more grieved than Melanchthon at the unsatisfactory result of his exertions.

Luther tried to comfort him. "If it be a lie," he wrote to Melanchthon in German, in the midst of a Latin epistle of the 30th of June—"if it be a lie that God gave His Son for us, may the devil be a man in my place. But if that be true, what business have we with our sorry fears and tremors, our anxiety and mourning!" "In domestic afflictions," continued he, resuming his Latin, "I am the weaker, and thou art the stronger; but in public affairs the converse is true."[1] Luther also endeavoured in his letter to console the elector, and to strengthen him in the faith.

On the 13th of August, the Evangelical princes presented to the emperor a communication, in which they expressed their positive determination not to swerve from the word of God. They, however, manifested a willingness to enter into further negotiations. They proposed that each party should make choice of some few of its members, "well acquainted with the matters under discussion, and inclined to peace and unity, and depute them to treat with each other on the controverted articles in charity and amity." The Electors of Mentz and Brandenburg, and the Duke of Brunswick, acceded to this proposal. Each party selected a committee of theologians—Eck, Wimpina, and Cochlæus being on the one side, and Melanchthon, Brenz, and Schnepf on the other. Bishop Stadion, who earnestly warned the Romanists to do nothing against the word of God, succeeded in bringing about another religious conference, which lasted from the 16th to the 21st of August. Article after article was examined, and mutual concessions were made, but to no purpose, save that they were the occasion of no small annoyance to Melanchthon, whose health began to suffer in consequence. He was already forced to listen to severe reproaches, on account of his excessive pliancy. Luther nobly defended him against unjust censure, while, at the same time, he privately admonished his friend to yield nothing further.

[1] *In privatis luctis infirmior ego, tu autem fortior; contra in publicis tu talis, qualis ego in privatis, et ego in publicis talis, qualis tu in privatis* (De Wette, iv. No. 1240; see also Nos. 1234, 1236, 1237).

As, in spite of every effort, no understanding could be arrived at, the emperor, through the medium of Frederick the Count Palatine, informed the Evangelicals of his displeasure at their persistence as a minority in "introducing a strange doctrine, adverse to the faith of the whole world, although the lesser number should follow the lead of the greater." The Protestants, however, were as firm on this occasion as they had previously been at the Diet of Speier, in refusing to acknowledge the right of the majority to rule in matters of faith.

Melanchthon, in the meantime, had been preparing a written defence of his *Confession* against the *Confutation* of the Romanists, although the latter document was not in his possession,[1] and he was obliged to recall it from memory. On the 22d of September, he delivered this *Apology for the Confession* to the emperor, who, however, would not accept it. It consists of fourteen articles, and, as a commentary on the briefer Confession, forms the second volume in the collection of Lutheran confessional works.

Those of the Evangelicals who refrained from committing themselves to the Augsburg Confession on account of its doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, were not willing to abstain from all confession of their faith. Hence the four cities of Strassburg, Costnitz, Memmingen, and Lindau submitted to the Diet their particular Confession, called the *Tetrapolitana* (Confession of the Four Cities), in the composition of which the Strassburg theologians Bucer and Hedio bore the principal part.[2] This Confession consisted of twenty-two articles, which, though differing as to letter from those of the Augsburg Confession, yet accord in purport and spirit with the latter instrument. Even the definition of the

[1] He did not obtain it until later. At the time to which we refer, he was re-touching the *Apology*, while Jonas was translating it into German.

[2] *Confessio oder Bekantnus der vier frey und Reichstätt, Strässburg, Costantz, Memmingen, und Lindaw, in der sie Kais. Maj. auff dem Reichstag zu Augspurg im XXX. Jar gehalten, jres Glaubens und fürhabens, der Religion halben rechenschaft gethan haben.*

Lord's Supper, as contained in the Tetrapolitan Confession, is so worded that sharp eyes are requisite to detect the distinction between the doctrine therein set forth and the teaching of the Confession of Augsburg on the same point. While the tenth article of the latter asserts that the body and blood of Christ are veritably present (*vere adsint*) in the bread and wine, and are administered (*distribuantur*) to the communicant, in the eighteenth article of the Tetrapolitana it is declared that Christ does, in His sacrament, still give to His disciples "His true body and His true blood, truly to eat and to drink, for the nourishment of their souls and for their everlasting life, so that they abide in Him and He abides in them." The only difference is that the relation of Christ's body to the *bread* as bread is kept in the background. There is an unmistakeable advance manifest in this Confession in the direction of positive statement, as compared with the system of bare negation which was at first so prominent a feature in the doctrinal writings of the Evangelicals. A further characteristic of what has since been distinctively called the *Reformed* Church, may be remarked in the fact that the Tetrapolitana accords the foremost position to an article on the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and rejects in an article of considerable length (article twenty-second), the worship of images, on which point the Confession of Augsburg is silent.

Zwingle also, who did not in person attend the Diet, availed himself of this opportunity to transmit to the emperor a written confession of his faith.[1] This he submitted not simply from a desire to set forth his own individual confession, as he informed the emperor, but with a view to subjecting it, as well as everything else that he had written, to the judgment of the true Church—*i.e.*, the Church that is founded on the word of God.

In common with the Augsburg Confession, Zwingle pro-

[1] *Fidei Ratio ad Carolum V.* (*Opp.* iv.; CHRISTOFFEL, ii. pp. 237 sqq.). See MÖRIKOFER, ii. pp. 297 sqq.

fesses his belief in the Triune God (in accordance with the Nicene Creed), and his adherence to the ancient ecclesiastical definitions in regard to the person of Christ; the relation of the two natures he defines as in his writings on the Lord's Supper. He also sets forth Christ as the only mediator between God and man. He asserts that in Christ God has from the beginning chosen those who are appointed to salvation. In respect of original sin, Zwingle expresses himself in much milder terms than those employed in the Augsburg Confession. He apprehends this—original sin—as an infirmity, a malady, of human nature, and distinguishes it from actual intentional transgression, or the personal criminality of an individual. As prisoners of war must pay the penalty which would properly devolve upon him in whose service they are, so the posterity of Adam must suffer for the transgression committed by him. In Christ, however, that which was lost is restored; and in this restoration, children are included. Nor is it for us, Zwingle continues, presumptuously to pass judgment upon the children even of the heathen; it would be rash to assert that such are damned. The Church, in the true sense of the word, Zwingle affirms, is the congregation of the elect. To be distinguished from this, is the Church to which all belong who have in any way come in contact with Christ (Christian peoples, Christendom). It is the Church in the former sense of the word alone that is infallible. As the children of Christians belong to the Church just as truly as the children of the Israelites belonged to the covenant people of the Old Testament, the former should be baptized (as the latter were circumcised) even when they cannot yet exercise faith; they are baptized in view of the confession of the Church and in reliance upon God's promises. The sacraments are external institutions. Not only do they not effect the forgiveness of sins, they are not even mediatory thereto. The Spirit of God has no need of any conductor or bearer, for He Himself conducts and supports all things. Grace goes before the sacrament. The latter is but a testi-

mony of grace; thus the quails and locusts accompanied the wind, but were not themselves the occasion thereof, and thus the tongues at Pentecost were a testimony to the heaven-descended Spirit, but were not themselves the bearers of the Spirit. So, in like manner, grace is not initially communicated to a child through baptism, but baptism is a testimony to the Church that the child is a participant in grace. That *the true body of Christ is present* in the Lord's Supper, Zwingle himself now confesses (an advance as compared with the former teachings of Zwingle on this point!); he, however, honestly and openly guards against any misunderstanding of his meaning, by adding that this presence is vouchsafed only to the contemplation of *faith* (*fidei contemplatione*), whilst he directly and persistently rejects the doctrine of the presence of the natural body of Christ, and the corporeal eating thereof (with the mouth and teeth), as a papistic error, adhered to only by those who are looking back longingly to the flesh-pots of Egypt (a cut at Luther!).

Zwingle's amplification of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper —which doctrine, as presented by him, scarcely received due attention from the emperor—is for the most part a repetition of what had already been said by the Swiss Reformer elsewhere (in the eucharistic controversy); we therefore have no intention of pursuing the subject farther at present.

Ceremonies were regarded by Zwingle as in themselves indifferent. They are to be endured, he declares, in the spirit of charity, until the morning star shall arise in the hearts of those who cleave to them, provided that they are not contrary to the word of God. This, however, cannot be affirmed of pictures and images; therefore *they* should *not* be tolerated. In making this assertion, Zwingle deprecates the charge of being an enemy to art. Painting and sculpture are, he admits, precious gifts of God, if not perverted to the service of idolatry. As the preaching of the divine word is a matter of the first importance in the worship of God, Zwingle petitions for capable preachers. The race of clergy

equipped from head to foot according to rule,[1] he regards as useless devourers of the fruit of the land, and claims that the relation which they bear to the body of Christ is similar to that which humps and tumours sustain toward the natural body. Civil authority, even though it be of a tyrannous nature, should be obeyed. The doctrine of purgatory is rejected as a fiction, derogatory to the merits of Christ. That there is a hell, Zwingle not only *believes*—he *knows* it.[2] In the portrayal of hell, his Humanistic reminiscences lead him back to the mythology of the ancients, and he speaks of Ixion and Tantalus. The eternal duration of the torments of hell, he (in harmony with the Augsburg Confession) maintains, in opposition to the doctrine of the Anabaptists.

"The above," Zwingle continues, "I firmly believe, teach, and defend, and that not of my own imagination, but from the word of God; and I pledge myself furthermore to continue so to do as long as my spirit remains in this body." He beseeches the emperor, together with the princes and nobles, not to pass over his communication as something unworthy of their attention, seeing that right counsels have ofttimes emanated from the simple, and Truth herself has chosen the lowly and insignificant to be her heralds. In regard to his culture and learning, moreover, Zwingle confesses that these are possibly of greater consequence than his enemies would willingly tolerate, or than they can afford to despise; he remarks, however, that he does not rely so much upon them as his foes conjecture. But above all, he points to the fruits of the Spirit, manifest in those churches which had been reformed in accordance with the word of God, and in view of those fruits he extols the graciousness and goodness of God.

Zwingle's communication was printed on the 3d of July, and reached Augsburg on the 8th; it, however, had not the honour of being laid before the Diet. Eck assailed it with

[1] *Genus mitratum atque pedatum.* [See D'AUBIGNÉ, vol. iv. p. 179.]
[2] *Non tantum credo sed scio.*

the utmost vehemence. In three days he prepared a pamphlet,[1] in which, with a pathos that is almost ludicrous, he represents Zwingle as a man who had been labouring for ten years to destroy all faith and all religion from among the Swiss, and to stir up the people against their rulers. The ravages which he had effected were worse, Eck declared, than those of the Turks, the Tartars, or the Huns. The body of Christ had been pronounced by him to be "common baker's bread;" he had trampled under foot the service of the sanctuary, and had outraged the images; the cloisters erected by the emperor's illustrious ancestors, the Hapsburgs, had been through his influence desecrated into temples of Venus and Bacchus. He had also drawn into the vortex of his impiety the people of Bern, of Raurach, of Schaffhausen, and of Mühlhausen; he had seduced the cities of St. Gall and Strassburg, and had invaded Hungary and Bohemia with his heresies. But, Eck remarked in conclusion, the greatest enormity that he had yet perpetrated, was his daring to address the emperor with such a work as his *Confession.*

Zwingle repelled the aspersions of Eck in no gentle terms. He compared the conduct of his opponent to that of a wild boar that has broken through a hedge, and in his fury tramples down all that he finds. Next follows an extensive dissertation on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, from which theme Zwingle seemed unable to detach his thoughts. In conclusion, he indignantly repels the charge of sacrilege asserted to have been committed upon the institutions founded by the Hapsburgs.

On the 22d of September, the *recess* of the Diet was read to the Evangelicals.[2] According to this decree, the Protestants were permitted as a special favour to take until the 15th of the ensuing April to consider whether they would come to an

[1] *Repulsio Articulorum Zwinglii.* To this Zwingle replied by his publication entitled, *Ad illustrissimos Germaniæ principes Augustæ congregatos, de convitiis Eckii* (*Opp.* iv. pp. 19 sqq.)

[2] [See D'Aubigné, vol. iv. pp. 216 sqq.—Tr.]

agreement with the Romish Church in respect to the points at issue. During the period specified, they were commanded to conduct themselves quietly, and neither to print nor sell within their territories anything relating to matters of faith; they were ordered to make no proselytes, and to leave the adherents of the old faith within Protestant domains undisturbed in the exercise of their religion; finally, they were required to unite with the emperor in the persecution of Sacramentarians and Anabaptists. The Protestants declined accepting this recess; they oppugned the assertion that they had been vanquished by scriptural arguments. On the 23d of September the Elector John quitted Augsburg, although the Diet continued its session. The Turkish war was then under discussion. The Estates that accepted the recess bound themselves to aid one another in every possible way in all matters pertaining to the ancient faith, and disobedience to the articles of this alliance was declared to be punishable with outlawry.

The recess was not published until the 19th of November.

It was a day of rejoicing to Luther when he was permitted to leave his solitude and return to the congenial society of his wife and children; nor did he conceal his delight that the elector was at last "set loose from hell." As for the rest, he committed the cause of the Evangelicals to God.[1]

[1] See Luther's letters of 24th and 28th September, one of which (No. 1310) is addressed to his wife, while the other (No. 1311) is to Lazarus Spengler, DE WETTE, iv. p. 174.

CHAPTER XXIII.

IMPORT OF THE CONFESSIONS—GENERAL VIEW OF PROTESTANT DOCTRINE; OR, THE PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANTISM.

THE close of the Diet of Augsburg has brought us to a new period in the history of the Reformation, or at least that portion of it which has reference to Germany. A convenient stopping-place is thus afforded us, from which, while we interrupt for a time the course of our narrative, we may strive to become better acquainted with the intrinsic essence of that Reformation for the establishment of which the Evangelicals were labouring, with the doctrines maintained by the Reformers, and with various other matters connected with the movement. The presentation of the Confession of Augsburg and the Tetrapolitan and Zwinglian Confessions, events so closely interwoven with the history of the Diet itself, offers, moreover, a most fitting occasion for a survey such as we have indicated.

We shall, in the first place, inquire into the *import of such Confessions.* On this subject there has been, and still is, a diversity of opinion. If we ask one class of observers, they will tell us that in these Confessions the jewel of evangelical faith has been deposited for all ages; that in each of them an ever-valid rule is given, to which all must conform who would discharge the office of teacher in that particular ecclesiastical community whose doctrines they profess, or who are desirous merely of truly belonging to the same. According to this, every person who claims either clerical or lay membership in the Evangelical Churches, is pledged to the very letter of these Confessions. A second class of thinkers,

on the other hand, promptly reject such a demand as the foregoing, claiming that it is in direct opposition to the spirit and tenor of the Reformation; they utter words of warning against a new papacy of paper, which, under certain circumstances, might become still more contemptible than the actual pontificate in flesh and blood. The class to which we refer, behold in the confessional writings mere historical documents, from which the searcher of history may derive information concerning the religious tenets of our fathers as set forth in their own words, but which are of as little practical moment to the present generation as is the costume of those bygone days in which the Confessions originated,—a garb that none would now think of imitating save in jest.

Let us examine these two views a little more particularly. As to the first, it is in the form of its presentation at variance with history itself. Ecclesiastical history, it is true, does afford instances of Confessions which have issued from synods, or similar authorities, for the purpose of affixing a limit to the arbitrary exhibition of doctrines within the pale of the Church, or for the erection of a barrier against heresies. Confessions such as we describe, we have already met with in the history of the ancient Church, and at some future period we shall see that like prescription of faith and doctrine were also introduced into the Evangelical Church, or that their introduction was at least attempted. As to the extent to which such rules of doctrine are justifiable, we do not at present propose to inquire. We will but ask whether the Confessions tendered at the Diet of Augsburg *were* such rules of doctrine. Manifestly they were *not*. They were not addressed to their own ecclesiastical party with a view to the regulation of what had before been unregulated, or to the suppression of some erroneous tendency; but they were directed to a body external to the party, by which they were formulated to the Romish Church, or, rather, to the German Empire, that had called the upholders of the Evangelical faith to account. Nine years before, *Luther* as a simple

monk, appealing only to his own conscience and the word of God, had confronted the emperor and the empire at Worms. At the Diet of Augsburg, a similar stand was taken *without* Luther by the host of his confessors, or rather the confessors of the gospel, who had in the interim grown to be a power in the empire. The confessional writings were nought else than *Apologies,* vindications of faith;[1] they were living *testimonies* to that which, amid fiery conflicts, had in the consciences of the confessors approved itself to be truth. These writings, furthermore, were not intended to contain a complete system of doctrine; for when the imperial party insidiously demanded of the Protestants whether they had in their Confession said all that they had to say, the Protestants replied that various other things might have been said, but they had confined themselves to those statements that had appeared to them the most necessary. This answer, considered aright, leaves room for a further development of doctrine. The Confessions were not the theological elaborations of learned men; though framed by accomplished theologians, they were the expression of the common faith of preacher and layman, of prince and people. The signatures to these instruments were not appended with a view to what should be in the *future;* the idea was not, We *promise* to teach such and such things. It was with the *present* that the subscribers were concerned; such and such things, they declared, we *do* believe and teach. No inquiry into the facilities which these rudiments of a system of faith might offer for the formation of a Protestant scheme of theology—no query as to the mode in which the convictions of men's hearts, as expressed in these Confessions, might, after the lapse of centuries, be formulated, to meet the intelligent contemplation of scientific minds—suggested itself to the framers of the documents in question. The object of prime importance in the eyes of the confessors was to gain a

[1] The Confession of Augsburg was at first entitled an Apology; the Tetrapolitan Confession also claimed to "give an account of the creed and intentions of its formers," and Zwingle styles his own communication to the emperor a *ratio.*

legitimate foot-hold on the soil of the present, and there to make good their stand. They thought not, at that early day, of marking out the boundaries of the prospective internal development of doctrine.

That the confessors should express themselves in their own language, in the language of their time, was natural. Strange as it would appear, were we now to array ourselves in garments modelled after the fashion of that period, it would be equally absurd for us to expect to find the doctrines of our fathers clothed in the language of our modern schools of theology and the expressions of modern culture.

None the less, however, are the Confessions to which we have reference not mere superannuated relics of the past, interesting only from a historical and antiquarian point of view, and to be numbered with the thousand and one documents that none save an indefatigable inquirer into the records of bygone days need be at the pains of investigating. On the contrary, these Confessions, as every examiner of them must be convinced, are of so forcible and penetrating a nature, that without a knowledge of them we should be unable to understand the history of the Reformation, or to appreciate the battles that were waged for its sake. On this account, therefore, we have devoted more attention to these documents than we have accorded to other papers possessing in reality a mere transient and historical value. Not only the theologian, but every cultivated member of the Church, should be sensible of a lively interest in these documents of the faith, in which pulsates the innermost life of the growing Evangelical Church. But besides this, it will in all time be incumbent on the ministers of the Evangelical Church (nor is such obligation an unworthy check upon Christian liberty) not only to make the purport of these confessional definitions of doctrine the subject of studious reflection, but also conscientiously to determine whether that purport, notwithstanding our modern changes of expression as to detail, continues to be accepted as a whole — whether, in short, modern

doctrine, in respect of its inner substance, still accords with that confessed by the fathers and founders of our Evangelical Church. Such an agreement with the leading principles of the Reformation, with the tenets which distinguished the Reformers proper from the adherents of the Romish Church on the one hand, and the various sects on the other, may assuredly be demanded of every person who is desirous of assuming the functions of a minister in that Church which is the offspring of the Reformation. What those leading principles are, and what are the tenets that involve the distinction of which we have spoken, we will now proceed to inquire.

In the first place, it must be remembered that the Reformers had no idea of founding a new religion. It was not Christianity, but the fetters of Papacy, by which they felt themselves straitened. They were not men of progress in the sense of desiring to overstep the foundation laid by the prophets and apostles—nay, by Christ the Son of God. In those facts of salvation whereon the Church has rested from the beginning, they avowed their belief, in language as positive as it was straightforward. They stood upon the same historical platform of revelation as the Catholics. Accordingly, they retained unchanged the ecclesiastical definitions relating to the Trinity of the Divine Being and the person and work of Christ, and expressed their disapprobation of every attempt to alter those conceptions. The subject of dispute was not the bare fact of salvation in Christ, not the mysteries of the incarnation and redemption, but the personal appropriation and mediation of salvation. Not the goal itself, but the way to attain thereto, was the occasion of controversy. How is salvation to be obtained? Where are the pure and untroubled sources of the knowledge thereof to be found? How can we most surely attain unto Christ, and, through Him, to God? how be assured of eternal salvation in life and in death? Such were the questions that engaged the attention of the Reformers. The way to salvation they found blocked up by all manner of human ordinances,

the removal of which, and consequent opening of the road to all anxious inquirers, they strove with singleness of mind to accomplish. They sought not to shake the Church, but to purify it and re-establish it upon its original basis. Various means to this end were adopted, as suggested by the direction in which the need for reform became apparent. Luther was induced to set out upon his career as a Reformer in consequence of that profound anxiety on the subject of a personal assurance of salvation which had been experienced by himself, and with which his ministry at the confessional rendered him familiar in the case of others. His first appearance as a champion of reform, occasioned as it was by the trade in indulgences, had to do with the personal appropriation of salvation by repentance and faith. That man is justified before God not by works, but by faith, was the fundamental dogma from which he started. This dogma, grasped by Luther not as the fruit of painstaking speculation, but as the trophy of a hard-fought battle, he constituted his standard for determining the relative authority of the biblical Scriptures,[1] which latter he regarded as containing the normal expression of the divine word. With Zwingle the case was different. He, as well as Luther, held the Pauline doctrine of justification, but that doctrine did not occupy so prominent a place in his mind. Like the Saxon Reformer, he was thoroughly in earnest in the endeavour to secure his own salvation, and in the determination of his personal relation to the living God. A multitude of passages in his writings attest the heartiness of this effort on his part. But in the case of Zwingle, a personal craving for salvation was connected, from the outset, with all that concerned the welfare of the people whose pastor he was called to be. His programme of reformation was from the outset more extensive than that of Luther. The abolition of public abuses in the life of the people as well

[1] [It has been said that Luther doubted the authenticity of the Epistle of James and the book of Revelation, because the doctrine of justification by faith seemed to him to be absent therefrom.—Tr.]

as of the Church, the unprejudiced testing of every institution or tradition, however sanctioned by custom, by its conformity or lack of conformity to the rule laid down in the Holy Scriptures, in the law, and in the gospel, was from the outset the earnest design of Zwingle. And yet, different as were the ways of the two men of whom we are speaking, there existed, in more than one respect, a perfect harmony between them. To be received with allowance is, therefore, the statement that Luther laid particular stress upon the *material* principle of the Reformation, while Zwingle gave greater prominence to its *formal* principle; or, in other words, that Luther's point of departure was the doctrine of justification, and Zwingle's the sole authority of Scripture. For Zwingle incorporated the doctrine of justification by faith in his system, together with those other Christian truths which he found revealed in the Scriptures; and Luther professed his acceptance of the Scriptures as the one rule of faith and action. To the word of God as contained in the Scriptures, Luther, indeed, subjected all things, even the conclusions of reason, and by that word he regarded himself as bound in the face of all human authority or philosophy. In contrasting the conduct of the two Reformers, therefore, the utmost that we are warranted in affirming is that either one or the other principle was *predominant* in the case of each individual; for, far from the two principles being mutually contradictory, they did but constitute the different poles of one fundamental principle, which was the proclamation of the one pure gospel as man's sole and sufficient authority in reference both to the *way* which he has to tread, and to the *light* which is to guide him on that way. The advantage to be gained is therefore but slight if we term Luther's Reformation a predominantly *subjective* one, and style that which was inaugurated and carried on by Zwingle an *objective* Reformation; meaning that the starting-point of the former was that personal, individual craving for salvation which made itself felt in the inward man, while the point of departure for the Zwinglian

Reformation was to be found in the open and manifest disorders of the Church, and of ecclesiastical and congregational life.

Others, again, have asserted that the difference between the two paths of reform consists in the (alleged) fact, that the chief force of Luther's opposition was directed against the Judaizing spirit of legality; while Zwingle, on the other hand, chiefly assailed the heathenish spirit of lawlessness, and the tendency to substitute the worship of the creature—the deification of the creature and of nature—for the worship of God. It is true that Luther removed the yoke of the law from the consciences of men, as Paul had done before him. But did not Zwingle do the self-same thing? And did not Luther oppose heathenish disorderliness with the same energy as Zwingle? Did not Zwingle, moreover, in common with the Humanists of his time, set forth the nobler qualities of heathenism more prominently than did Luther? (We shall revert farther on to a consideration of this question.) It is undoubtedly true that in the sequel (to the result of which we are about speaking, Calvin contributed his influence) the legal spirit of the Old Testament impressed a peculiar stamp upon the Reformed Church; and, on a comparison of the different Confessions, the thought will arise that the detestation of images, expressed in the Confessions of Zwingle and the four cities, and on the other hand the free conception of the Sabbath set forth in the Augsburg Confession, may in a certain sense be said to illustrate the assertion which we have cited at the head of this paragraph. It is an unmistakeable fact that Zwingle gives greater prominence to the *majesty* of God in His exaltation far above every creature, to the *unapproachableness* of the Eternal and Infinite One,—attributes so grandly portrayed in the Old Testament,—than does Luther, who indeed assumes a tone of almost too great familiarity in speaking of God and divine things. The writings of Zwingle exhibit more of the sublime aspect of religion; those of Luther depict it in its appeal to the human heart. In perusing the

former, we are carried back to the classical language of antiquity, while the latter remind us of the romance and mysticism of the Middle Ages. All these things, however, are but relative distinctions that never amount to actual antitheses. The traits of unity considerably outweigh the distinctions; and those traits of unity were the only ones that were of import, so far as the Romish Church was concerned. The antithesis between Luther and Zwingle found its single expression in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; for the doctrine of predestination, which afterwards constituted a point of distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, originally involved no such antitheses, but was held in common by all Reformers, however different their standpoints might be. Even the eucharistic difference was not in its nature invincible, so far as any principle therein involved was concerned, although in point of fact it remained unconquered. In history the thread of development is never spun off so clearly that some knots are not found, whose unravelling is reserved for future centuries. Such was the case with the Reformation. The eucharistic controversy opposed a check to its quiet progress; nor will we deny that the still more deeply-based distinctions indicated above may have been influential in the result produced. As, however, these differences do not appear to us to be of sufficient importance to require a division of the Reformation into two principally distinct movements, we may look away for a while from such distinctions, which will appear more conspicuously at a later period, and fasten our eyes upon the principles of Protestantism common to both branches of the Reformation.

Let us begin with a consideration of the so-called *formal principles*—*i.e.*, let us ask, Upon what authority did the Reformers base their creed? where did they seek and find their fountains of religious knowledge?

It is a current saying that the principle of the Reformation was that of *free investigation* in the face of all *authority*. This, however, is not a fair presentment of the case—from the

historic point of view, at all events. It is true that the Reformers did advocate and practise free investigation in opposition to authority; but neither term is to be taken in an unlimited sense. In opposition to the authority of the *Romish Church*, they insisted upon the free investigation of *Scripture*. As we have already said, they did not desire to found a new religion, or by speculation to arrive at the knowledge of a truth as yet unknown. Truth, they acknowledged, had long ago been found; they beheld it revealed in the *word of God*. The word of God, again, they held to be contained in the Holy Scriptures. To the authority of this word they subjected themselves unconditionally—Luther as well as Zwingle, and Zwingle as well as Luther. For them the Scripture possessed a double import, as the source and rule of religious knowledge, as well as the medium of edification. It was the fresh fountain from which they drew consolation in every trial, and encouragement to persevere in the right. With the Bible in hand they opposed the traditions and ordinances of the Church, as well as the "human inventions" of Scholastic wisdom; and so, in reference to their own and the people's edification, they regarded the preaching of the word as far excelling all ceremonies and rites, even the operation of the sacrament being considered by them (especially by Zwingle) as linked with the operation of the word.

Concerning the relation of the divine word to *Scripture*, *i.e.* to that collection of writings of the Old and New Testaments transmitted to us from past ages, they entered upon no scientific investigation; yet we have seen that Luther was accustomed to make a distinction between the different books of Holy Writ, and we know how far removed he was in general from a spirit of anxious literalism. That in some cases, as for instance in the eucharistic controversy, he adhered unduly to the letter of Scripture, must indeed be admitted. But the very men whose perception of the breathings of the Divine Spirit in the Scriptures was far deeper and stronger

than that of many others, were the least calculated to draw up a scholastically-correct theory concerning this inspiration of Scripture; and hence their inconsistencies in regard to this subject are far more endurable than the rigid and stiff consistency of the orthodox dogmatical theologian of later times. The men of the Reformation were led by a wholesome feeling when they sought to explain Scripture by Scripture—when they endeavoured to throw light upon obscure passages by comparing them with other and clearer ones. Although modern learning may, in respect of historic criticism and more clearly-defined doctrinal distinctions, have outstripped the theology of the Reformers (and after the lapse of three centuries it would be sad if such were not the case), the principle laid down by the Reformers is none the less worthy of acceptance to-day than when it was first advanced. The Evangelical Church of the present time rests, as it did three hundred years ago, on the declarations, rightly apprehended, of the word of God. Its ministers are ministers of that word, whose duty it is to preach, as evangelical truth, not their own inventions, nor any system of human wisdom, but such things only as are based upon the word of which we speak, as are in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and agreeable to their spirit (not their letter). The Scriptures will for ever constitute not merely the foundation of evangelical theology, but also, in a manner peculiar to themselves, the household treasury of every evangelical family, the religious touchstone of every individual evangelical Christian. However modern culture may mould the scientific apprehension of Scripture, its *religious*, its *saving* import will ever continue the same.

Like observations are true in regard to what has been called the *material principle* of the Reformation, the evangelical doctrine of grace and justification by faith. It was the experience of Luther, if of any man, that man is utterly unable with all his exertions to attain unto peace with God through the works of the law. The language of the Apostle Paul concerning the distinction between the law and the

gospel, between the freedom of the natural man and the freedom of one who is born of God, was adopted by Luther from the deepest conviction of soul. And so, in a different mode and connection, Zwingle also speaks of the eternal mercy and grace of God—grace which, not by reason of any human merit, but by the free impulse of its essence, is led to compassionate the weak and sinful creature. With this conviction the Reformers opposed both the heaven-storming pride of those who would secure salvation by their own power and defiantly prefer a claim to merit in the sight of God, and the faint-heartedness of those who, under the pressure of the law and sin, despair of God's mercy. The doctrine of justification by faith has been objected to on the ground that it disparages human freedom, enervates moral effort, and gives a welcome support to slothfulness in well-doing. These objections are, however, based wholly upon misunderstandings. It is but a superficial view of the subject that can discover a destruction of freedom where its spiritual re-energizement should be seen. It was proposed to remove the frail supports of morality to which Christendom had trusted for centuries, and to give a firm substructure to the moral life by basing it upon religion. The free agency of man is apparently denied by Luther in contradistinction to Erasmus; but which of those two individuals was in reality the morally free man, independent of human fear and favour? In ascribing all good things to the grace of God, and thus rejecting the idea of human merit, in what respect did the Reformers differ from us when we, in other and intellectual domains (that of art, for instance), admire not the exertions of the artist, but the finished work, the product of a higher inspiration? Not the thing *made*, but the thing that has *come into being*, the development of which is always a mystery to us,—the thing which God Himself has created, which is born of the Spirit, for whose origin the artist cannot always satisfactorily account to himself,—this it is which ravishes the soul when we gaze, admiring, upon a great work of art. And should it be otherwise in religious matters?

The more complete the renunciation of all pretension to merit on the part of the human actor, the more unsullied is the moral action, the purer our admiration thereof; admiration which, moreover, we owe not to the creature, but to Him who worketh to will and to do after His good pleasure. In such a renunciation as the above, humility consists—not the counterfeit presentment, but the real grace, peculiar as that is to Christianity. In this renunciation of all personal merit, in the surrender of oneself to the free grace of God, there is incontestably something grand, as contrasted either with that painful legal righteousness that causes the seeker after it to smart under the yoke of the law, or with that haughty self-exaltation that emboldens the harbourer of it to reckon up his exploits before God, in the vain expectation of thus balancing his account with his Maker.

The grace of God is apprehended by man in the exercise of *faith;* hence the great prominence invariably given by the Reformers to faith, which they declared to be all-important in the justification of man before God,[1] is perfectly intelligible: But we should totally misunderstand the teaching of the Reformers were we to regard the faith of which they speak as a bare credence of historic or doctrinal truth, or a mere theoretical assent of the intellect. The confessional writings themselves in several passages deprecate such a misunderstanding, as also the idea that good works were rejected by the framers. By faith the Reformers understood a trusting surrender of the soul, or rather of the whole inner man, to the saving grace of God. Far from seeking faith outside the domain of morality, faith, as they contended, is itself the moral power whence the new life proceeds.[2] Good works seemed to them to be not a mere appendix or addition to faith, but the direct fruits thereof; they believed that they were not to be laboriously accumulated one after the other

[1] It is true that upon this doctrine Luther laid greater stress than Zwingle.

[2] [It has been beautifully said by a German theologian of the present day, that "*trust* is the *soul*, and *obedience* the *body* of faith."—Tr.]

from without, but that they were to be acquired from the tree of life as the product of a mind renewed by the Spirit of God.

As in the case of the scriptural principle of the Reformers, so in regard to the principle of faith, all depends upon a correct apprehension of it. As the former was so perverted as to cause the Bible to be regarded in the light of a code, which theologians were to apply in much the same manner as jurists apply the civil code, and in which the letter was to prevail over the spirit, instead of the converse; so faith was soon converted into a dead work, a work of the head, of the lips, on which at last a claim to merit was based—a claim more perilous than any ever founded on good works. For, to perform the latter, some exertion at least was requisite; but this false faith-righteousness was easily attained, and none were better pleased with it than intellectual sluggards and moral cowards. The history of the Church in the period immediately succeeding the Reformation abounds in examples of such deviation from the true doctrine of the Reformers, and even the age of the Reformation itself was not free from the error. Luther must needs sigh over so gross a misunderstanding of his doctrine and so scandalous an abuse of it as a cloak for wickedness. The experience of the Apostle Paul was the same. The higher the value of faith and of that evangelical liberty thence resultant, the more imminent the danger of misunderstanding and abuse. But while we maintain our grasp upon the scriptural principle of the Reformation, should such a consideration as the above prevent us from holding fast to the principle of faith advanced by the Reformers, from retaining it as a fundamental principle of the Evangelical Church, as a jewel which we would not barter either for an anxious legalism or for that theory of the mutual independence of belief and action which snatches the living deed from the sanctuary of religious sentiment, and severs morality from faith? The frigid, moral sermonizing of a later period, with its abstract conception of virtue, found

scanty access to the hearts of men, as compared with the mighty preaching of faith by the Reformers. We shall have at some future time an opportunity of seeing that the perverted handling of the truths of faith, in the form of dogmatical tenets utterly devoid of any moral import, was on the other hand equally as pernicious as the opposite treatment of the doctrine of morality, without a deeper foundation of faith.

We have already called attention to the fact, that those two principles which have been styled the Formal and Material Principles of the Reformation, are in reality but the two poles of one and the same principle of reform. This one principle, negatively expressed, consists in the removal of every obstacle that bars the way to salvation in Christ. In positive terms, it amounts to a re-enthronement of that free and living *confession of Christ* from which, in the course of the ages, men had lapsed away. For what purpose are we directed to the Scriptures, if not because they testify of *Christ?* Wherefore is faith pressed upon us, but because the believer seeks and finds salvation in *Christ? Christ* it is, according to the view of the Reformers, to whom, as the fulness of the promises, all Scripture tends; *He* is the substance of faith; *He* is at once the beginner and finisher of faith; *He* is the only mediator between God and man. As before remarked, the controversy of the Reformers and the Romish Church did not respect the *person* and *work* of Christ *in themselves.* In regard to this point there was at first no dispute. The Romish Church had preserved the doctrine concerning the Son of God and Son of man, in its objectivity, in the form transmitted by the primitive Church, viz. the *one* person consisting of two natures. But Rome's teaching concerning the believer's *relation* to Christ was widely different from that of the primitive Church. Christ was no longer the *only* mediator between God and man. It indeed may be affirmed that He was altogether ousted from His mediatorial office. He was regarded simply as the "Lord

God," the future Judge, from whose wrath men sought refuge at the knees of the "mother of God." *She* was now the mediatrix, and the rest of the saints shared in the mediatorial office in heaven; the faithful implored their intercession. On earth, the hierarchy (with the pope at the head thereof) usurped the mediatorship between the laity and God (Christ). The Reformation, in removing all these human mediatorial agencies, reopened for believers the way to Christ, and through Him to the Father. And this led to a reformation of the doctrine concerning the *Church*.

A great theologian of modern times (Schleiermacher) has advanced, as one of the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism, the statement that the Roman Catholic arrives at faith in Christ by first believing in the Church; while the Protestant, believing first in Christ, holds himself to be, through that belief and his consequent condition as a member of Christ's body, connected with the Church, the congregation of the Lord. The Reformers had as little idea of establishing a new church as of founding a new religion. It cost Luther some hard struggles to separate himself from the old Romish Church. The Protestants held that the Church is where Christ is, where His word is preached, and where the sacraments are administered according to His institution and agreeably to the spirit and intent of His command. From the external visible institution of the Church, which, when resting upon the foundation of the divine word, they did not depreciate, they distinguished that kernel of the Church which is withdrawn from the eye of man,—the fellowship of the faithful with Christ, the communion of saints, of the elect. Only God, the searcher of hearts, knows who really belongs to this fellowship. In regard to the constitution, arrangement, discipline, and practice of the visible Church, the Reformers held that these all might differ according to circumstances. They set a higher value upon unity in the spirit than upon unity of constitution and identity of rites.[1] None

[1] See *supra*, chap. xvii., on Luther's treatise on Ecclesiastical Order.

the less peremptorily, however, did they insist upon the preservation of order in opposition to the disorderly courses of the fanatics. Protestant doctrine recognises no special priesthood stamped as such with an indelible character. Spiritual priesthood is common to all Christians. The ministry of the word is, however, connected with the function of *instruction* established by the Church. The Protestant Church is not a priestly Church, but a popular Church. It will not merge itself in the State, but neither would it engulf the State. Though the relation of State and Church continued undefined in many particulars, the Protestant Church came to an immediate understanding with the State and the civil authority in regard to one point, by inserting in its Confessions an article "Concerning Rulers," in which article the latter were, in accordance with Scripture, recognised as ordained of God, any revolt against them being stigmatized as worthy of punishment. A new relation was assumed by the Church of the Reformation in regard not only to the discipline of the State, but also in respect to the constitution of the family; marriage, which forms the basis of this latter constitution, being declared admissible for ministers of the Church, and celibacy being no longer considered a special requisite of piety.

Neither the Church militant on earth, with its priesthood, as we have shown above, nor, on the other hand, the Church triumphant in heaven, with its throng of saints, was permitted to interpose between souls that were hungering for salvation—believing souls—and the Redeemer, whom faith discerns at the right hand of God. Mediæval doctrine had, it is true, observed a distinction between *adoration* and *invocation*. The former was declared to pertain only to God; the latter might properly be offered to saints. But even this invocation for intercession was rejected by Protestantism, although the commemoration of saints was sanctioned, and they were recommended as patterns for imitation. Thus, also, the sacrament of the altar, uplifted or carried about in procession

for the adoration of the people, could constitute no object of worship for the Evangelical Church.[1]

Different as the views of the Reformers at this time still were in regard to the import of the *sacraments*, and especially of the Lord's Supper, the leaders of the Reformation, consistently with their doctrine concerning the word of God and faith, agreed in maintaining that a mere outward participation in the sacraments was in itself insufficient for salvation; they opposed the doctrine of the *opus operatum*, and insisted, in this connection as in others, upon the requisiteness of a living faith. In rejecting the sacrifice of the mass as a repetition of Christ's sacrifice, and in abolishing masses for departed souls, the Reformers acted in harmony,—under the influence both of the *scriptural* principle, which is ignorant of such sacrificial transactions under the New Covenant, and of the *material* principle of reform, which beholds in the death of Jesus a perfect sacrifice, and regards the forgiveness of sins as dependent on faith in that one offering.

The comparative silence of Protestant doctrine in respect to what are called the "Last Things" has been objected to as a deficiency. We, on the contrary, regard this reserve as a wise reticence. The Reformers did not pretend to any new revelations in regard to the world to come. From the very fact that they made faith the all-important basis of their doctrine, they contented themselves with the intimations of Scripture concerning the Lord's return for judgment and the resurrection of the dead, and rejected both the doctrine of purgatory as held by the Romish Church, and the chiliastic dreams of the Anabaptists.

We have now, as we believe, delineated the main features of the faith of the Reformers, and have also furnished some

[1] Luther, indeed, at first held very conservative opinions on this point, as well as in some other respects. See his letter of 11th December 1523, to Leonard Puchler, fencing-master at Halle (DE WETTE, ii. No. 560). He left it to the option of every person to worship or not; should worship be offered, however, he said that it must be done in faith; the mere outward adoration of the lips and the knee availed nothing, he maintained.

suggestions as to the mode in which the permanent import and value of that faith may be extracted from the historic documents relative thereto. We do not assert that our interpretation of the different matters referred to is in every case and in all respects the right and fitting one; it has been our desire simply to endeavour to expose the inner motives which lay at the foundation of the great conflict whose history is now occupying us. It is not our intention to affirm that the motives indicated by us were the only ones prevalent in the Reformation, or even that all who professed the new method of religion were conscious of those motives. It may not be denied that among high and low, among princes and their subjects, all manner of motives were at work, concerning the purity of which some doubt may be entertained. Many were involuntarily swept away by the current of reform, and followed the example of others, without rendering to themselves any account of their faith. For that very reason, however, there is more urgent need that history should bespeak a hearing for those who felt impelled to furnish such an account before God and men. Let that need be our excuse for devoting an entire chapter to the discussion of the topic in question.

CHAPTER XXIV.

SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS—MARTYRDOM OF ADOLPH CLARENBACH AND PETER FLYSTEDT AT COLOGNE—PATRICK HAMILTON IN SCOTLAND—LOUIS BERQUIN IN FRANCE—DIET OF WESTERAS AND REFORMATION IN SWEDEN—DIET OF ODENSE AND REFORMATION IN DENMARK—LANDGRAVE PHILIP'S ALLIANCE WITH THE SWISS—THE SCHMALKALDIC LEAGUE—RELIGIOUS PEACE OF NUREMBERG—DEATH OF JOHN THE STEDFAST—RELIGIOUS WAR IN SWITZERLAND—BATTLE OF CAPPEL AND DEATH OF ZWINGLE—REVIEW OF ZWINGLE'S CHARACTER—SOLOTHURN: MAYOR WENGE—DEATH OF ŒCOLAMPADIUS—HENRY BULLINGER AND OSWALD MYCONIUS—FIRST CONFESSION OF BASEL.

HAVING concluded our doctrinal digression, we will now return to the narration of facts. But before resuming the thread of our history of the German Reformation, it will be necessary for us to give an account of some incidents which occurred either in the course of the year 1530 or previous to that time. In chapter ix. we noticed the spread of the Reformatory gospel in the Rhine provinces. The Evangelical doctrine had also gained a foothold in the territories of Berg. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, Adolph Clarenbach was born, of poor parents, in the parish of Luttringen and township of Lennep. He was educated at the Universities of Münster and Cologne, and, after applying himself diligently as a student, himself became a teacher. As co-rector at Münster, and subsequently at Wesel, he became associated with two Augustinian monks, John Clopris and Matthew Girdenich by name, who, under the influence of Luther's

writings, were in the habit of holding religious meetings for the study of the divine word. They called themselves the Synagogue. Clarenbach now zealously devoted himself to the spread of the gospel in the territories of Berg. In prosecuting this work he was utterly fearless of danger, and contemplated unmoved even the possibility of having to lay down his life for the truth. To such a conclusion of his labours he was actually called. His friend Clopris, pastor at Büderich, being summoned to Cologne under accusation of heresy, Clarenbach voluntarily accompanied him, in April of the year 1528. He was immediately arrested, by order of the council, and confined in the Frankenthurm. In the repeated examinations which he was forced to undergo, he stedfastly adhered to his faith. Towards the end of his imprisonment, which continued for eighteen months, a companion in captivity was accorded him in the person of Peter Flysted (Fleisteden), from the Jülichian village of the same name. This man, it must be admitted, had in some degree merited his incarceration by indecorous behaviour in the cathedral of Cologne. He had kept his hat on during the mass, and had manifested his detestation of that act of worship in a coarse and insulting manner.[1] A sojourn in the same cell with Clarenbach had, however, an enlightening effect upon his mind. The two together sought and received strength in prayer. Clarenbach was tried for heresy by Arnold von Tungern, whose acquaintance we have already made in the Reuchlinian controversy. Neither Von Tungern nor the pastor of Lennep, who visited Clarenbach, succeeded in prevailing upon the latter to recant. On the 24th of September 1529, Clarenbach and Flysted were led to the place of execution, followed by a vast concourse of people. "O Cologne! Cologne!" exclaimed Clarenbach, "how dost thou persecute the word of God!" Among the monks who accompanied the condemned Evangelicals on their journey to the stake, was an Augustinian who whispered words of gospel cheer to Clarenbach, thereby refreshing him

[1] He had spitten upon the ground at the elevation of the host.

not a little. When the fire was kindled, Adolph cried with a clear voice, "O Lord, into Thy hands I commend my spirit!"[1]

Previous to Clarenbach's martyrdom, Scotland had shed the blood of a man who may be regarded as the first Reformer of that country. Patrick Hamilton, a scion of an illustrious race that claimed kinship with the royal family of Scotland, was born in the year 1503. At the University of St. Andrews, where he prosecuted his studies, he devoted himself to classical literature, and also became acquainted with the writings of Luther. A journey to Germany, made in the year 1526, introduced him to personal intercourse with the Reformers of Wittenberg. At Marburg he attached himself to Francis Lambert. Having, through association with these men, become fully impregnated with the principles of the Reformation, he felt an ardent desire to communicate those principles to his own countrymen. He accordingly returned to Scotland and commenced the preaching of the new doctrine. But under the pretext of a disputation, to be held by himself and a Dominican monk named Campbell, he was decoyed to St. Andrews, and there arraigned before a spiritual tribunal. In his case, also, all attempts to induce him to withdraw from his faith proved fruitless. He was, however, himself successful in evangelizing the priest Alesse (Alesius), who was deputed to attend upon him. It being found impossible to obtain a recantation from him, he was delivered to the secular authorities as an obstinate heretic, and was by them condemned to the stake. At the age of twenty-five he was burned on the square before St. Salvator's College. While dying, he, like Clarenbach, commended his spirit to the Lord. His heroic death excited universal admiration, and the fact that Campbell, his accuser, died soon after in delirium, was by many regarded as a divine judgment.

The first sacrifices to the faith in France occurred about

[1] See GÖBEL, *Geschichte des Christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen evangelischen Kirche*, vol. i. p. 121; WIESMANN, in Piper's *Evangelischer Kalender* for 1851, pp. 163 sqq.

this time. As we intend to revert to these on some future occasion, we will at present mention only the fate of Louis Berquin, a nobleman of Artois and friend of Erasmus, who suffered death by the hand of the executioner on the 10th of November 1529. In Bohemia,[1] likewise, the fires of the stake were blazing for the destruction of heresy; nor was the arm of persecution idle in Hungary.[2]

In the north of Europe, on the contrary, the progress of Reform was attended with fewer hindrances. Three years before the Diet of Augsburg, the Reformation was triumphantly introduced in Sweden, at the Diet of Westerås, in June 1527. Representatives of the burgher and peasant classes were present at this Diet, in addition to the clergy and nobility. King Gustavus Vasa, who had studied at Wittenberg and had become acquainted with the doctrine of Luther, laid his programme of Reform before the Diet, supported by the theologian Olaf Petri, the same who had previously vanquished his antagonist, Peter Galle, in a public disputation.[3] After some stormy scenes, the nobility and high clergy professed their readiness to cede the estates of the Church to the secular government. "We are content," the bishops declared in a special deed, "with whatever wealth or poverty the king decrees us." They also expressed a desire to be released from further attendance on the Diets. In the year 1529, the king convoked an assembly of the Swedish clergy at Œrebro, for the purpose of entrusting them with the spiritual concerns of the Reformation. Here it was agreed without difficulty, that the pure word of God should be preached, and that the youth should be instructed in the same in the schools. It was decided, on the other hand, to make as few alterations as possible in ecclesiastical usages. In the course of the same year, Olaf Petri drew up a manual for the guidance of the clergy on such occasions as weddings, funerals, etc.

[1] See the *Persecutionsbüchlein* of C. CZERWENKA, Gütersloh, 1869, pp. 74 sqq.
[2] See *Schicksale der evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn*, 1520-1608, Leipsic, 1828.
[3] [See chap. ix. p. 220.—TR.]

The political foundation of the Reformation was laid in Denmark also in the year 1527, at the Diet of Odense. True, the prelates there obtained a confirmation of their privileges in respect of tithes, revenues, and the like, but it was resolved that they should no longer be permitted to hinder the free preaching of the word of God. The king (Frederick I.) succeeded in effecting the adoption of a constitution which guaranteed to the professors of Lutheranism the free exercise of their religion until the occurrence of a general council. Permission to marry was likewise accorded to the clergy. Until the time of which we speak, the Reformation had gained a more extensive foothold at Wiborg, on the peninsula of Jutland, than elsewhere in Denmark. Hans Tausen (Tausanus), a knight of the Order of St. John and a native of Funen, had, amid many struggles, preached the gospel and founded a school at Wiborg. There the Reformation was definitively established shortly after the Diet of Odense. The superfluous churches of the city were suppressed. The cathedral, however, with the bishop and his chapter, resisted the innovations. In the year 1529, the king called Hans Tausen to the Church of St. Nicholas at Copenhagen, and from that time the Reformation made progress in the capital city of Denmark. In the year 1530 a Diet was held there, attended by evangelical preachers from all parts of the kingdom. A few days after the presentation of the Confession of Augsburg, the Danish preachers laid before the Diet of Copenhagen (on the 9th or 11th of July) a Confession, the forty-two articles of which substantially coincide with the twenty-eight articles of the Augsburg Confession, though no previous agreement was entered into by the framers of the two symbols. The chief difference is, that the Danish Confession expressly insists upon the scriptural principle of the Reformation, and combats the Papacy in severer terms. From that time forth the city was gained over to the new order of things, although it subsequently became the scene of some conflicts.

And now let us return to our history of the German

Reformation. Soon after the close of the Diet of Augsburg in the autumn of 1530, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse concluded an alliance for six years with the Helvetic cantons of Zurich and Basel and the imperial city of Strassburg, with which latter he had previously, in the preceding June, entered into treaty.[1] In forming the alliance of which we speak, the landgrave acted independently of the other Evangelical princes, who still scrupled to connect themselves with men whose opinions in regard to the Eucharist differed from their own. In December of the year 1530 a Diet was held at Schmalkalden, at which were present, in addition to the Landgrave Philip, the Elector John of Saxony, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, the councillors of Margrave George of Brandenburg, and two counts of Mansfeld, one of whom was in attendance in the capacity of plenipotentiary of Duke Philip of Brunswick. There were also present ambassadors from the cities of Strassburg, Nuremberg, Costnitz, Ulm, Magdeburg, Bremen, Reutlingen, Heilbronn, Memmingen, Lindau, Kempten, Issny, Biberach, Windsheim, and Weissenburg. It will be observed that, while the above names are chiefly such as were subscribed to the Confession of Augsburg, the separate confessors of the four cities were also represented.[2]

At the Diet of Augsburg, the emperor had arrived at an agreement with the Catholic Estates, to the effect that his brother Ferdinand should be elected Roman king and future successor to the imperial dignity. Against this arrangement the Evangelicals protested. The Elector of Saxony despatched his son, John Frederick, to Cologne, where the election had been appointed to take place at the end of the year, to enter a protest against the affair. Notwithstanding this, however, Ferdinand was elected Roman king on the 5th of January 1531. Luther had recommended submission to this arrangement as to something that was inevitable. He attached the utmost importance to the retention of the electoral power by

[1] For particulars see MÖRIKOFER, vol. ii. pp. 256 sqq.

[2] See also KEIM, *Schwäbische Reformationsgeschichte*, p. 182.

his sovereign John. That power would be hazarded if Ernestine Saxony resisted the imperial desires. The electorate would in that case be transferred to the Albertine line. Such an event, Luther thought, would be a greater misfortune than the recognition of Ferdinand. He dreaded a division of the empire, and lifted up a voice of warning in view of such a catastrophe.[1] "These are distressing matters," he wrote to the elector under date of 12th December 1530, "God knows; but God grant that we make them not much worse by attempting to make them better." "The things that are to come lie not within the scope of man's knowledge and power, as all history teaches us." He shows that God had thus far arranged things better than men could possibly have anticipated; and he does not conceal his displeasure at Landgrave Philip's alliance with the Swiss, from which league, he declared, a great war might result. Then, however, he exclaims: "Ah, Lord God, I am too childish in such worldly affairs. I will pray—I do pray—that God will graciously protect and guide your electoral grace, as He hath done hitherto; or, should something transpire that I would not willingly behold, I pray that He may yet graciously continue with us, and bring us by ways of His own devising to a happy termination of our troubles. Amen."

No conclusion was reached during the first congress at Schmalkalden, several of the deputies having insufficient instructions. A second meeting was held in February 1531, when it was resolved to send a common protest to Cologne, and to petition the emperor to forbid the Attorney-General and the Imperial Chamber to enter into legal proceedings against the Protestants in matters pertaining to their religion. At the same time an effort was being quietly made by the Evangelicals to ascertain the strength of the forces that could be brought into the field by them in case of need; in making this calculation, they reckoned upon some foreign help, particularly that of Denmark. It was also decided that Melanchthon

[1] De Wette, iv. No. 1333.

should make out a statement, which, translated into French, might be sent to the different European courts for the purpose of refuting the slanderous charges disseminated against the Protestant party. A third congress was held at Schmalkalden on the 29th of March, when a formal alliance was at length concluded, the outlines of which had been projected at the electoral court of Saxony. In the preamble to the document drawn up on this occasion, the following statement was made:—There appears to be an intention that those who have permitted the pure word of God to be preached, and abuses to be abolished in their domains, shall be forcibly diverted from their Christian designs; since, however, it is the duty of every Christian ruler not only to have the word of God proclaimed to his subjects, but also to use his utmost endeavours to prevent his subjects from being constrained to fall away from the divine word, they, the contracting parties, had, simply for such purposes of self-defence and safety as are admissible in the case of every individual, according both to divine and human laws, united in the following compact: "As soon as any one of them should be attacked for the gospel's sake, or on account of any matter resulting from adherence to the gospel, all of them would at once proceed to the rescue of the attacked party, and aid him to the utmost of their ability." It was, however, expressly declared that this Christian agreement was entered into without hostile intentions against the emperor, or any of the imperial Estates, or any person whomsoever, but purely for the preservation of Christian truth and peace in the German Empire, and for the resistance of violence and wrong.

Thus was formed the Schmalkaldic League, its duration being at first limited to six years. The Landgrave of Hesse exerted himself most vigorously to secure the inclusion of the Swiss, with whom he had formed a private alliance, in this greater league; but his proposal was rejected by the Electorate of Saxony at a princes' Diet held at Frankfort in the same year. Fewer objections were raised to the accession of the

four cities, Bucer having succeeded in influencing Luther to consent to their admission.[1]

Luther could not, however, agree with the mediator Bucer in thinking the sacramental controversy a dispute about mere words; he was ready, he declared, to die for his opinion, if such should be the will of God, but he hoped that by God's grace the Strassburgers would yet arrive at the true view of the sacrament.[2] On the other hand, he would hear nothing of a union with the Swiss, either with Zwingle or Œcolampadius.

The answers of foreign powers were favourable to the Schmalkaldic League. Francis I. of France, who was a persecutor of Protestants in his own country, willingly promised his aid to an alliance that threatened to become dangerous to his rival the emperor. Henry VIII. of England also admitted that there was great need for reform in the Church, but stated that caution should be exercised in dealing with people who underrated the intent of rulers. (He had not gotten over the vexation that Luther's rude attack upon himself occasioned him.) He also looked forward with hope to a general council.

The emperor, meantime, was meditating the rupture of the Schmalkaldic League. In his endeavour to effect this, he had recourse to stratagem. The disagreement between Electoral Saxony and Hesse had not escaped his observation, and of it he accordingly availed himself for the furtherance of his designs. He despatched the Counts of Nassau and Neuenar to the elector, charging them to inform him that the cause of the

[1] See Luther's letter to Bucer of the 22d January, another to Zell's wife of 24th January, and one to Duke Ernest of Lüneburg of 1st February, DE WETTE, iv. Nos. 1347–1349.

[2] "In fine, we will pray and hope until a perfect agreement is reached, and not be premature in our rejoicings before we are really united. . . . Next to Christ, my Lord, there is nothing upon which my heart is so set as the thorough union of these people with us; for the attainment of this object there is no death so bitter that I would not willingly endure it; and if God should fulfil my desire, I would then cheerfully die, and take my leave of this world, should such be the will of God" (DE WETTE, *l.c.* p. 220). See also Nos. 1352, 1353.

emperor's ungraciousness towards him at the Diet of Augsburg was the suspicion entertained by his Imperial Majesty that John adhered to the atrocious doctrine of the Swiss in regard to the Lord's Supper; the emperor further invited John to attend the impending Diet at Speier, and there to answer for himself. But the elector simply referred the imperial envoys, in behalf of their master, to the Confession of Augsburg, in which clear expression had been given to his views concerning the controverted point. Under the plea of illness, he also excused himself from attendance upon the Diet of Speier.

In the summer of 1531, the members of the Schmalkaldic League assembled at Frankfort-on-the-Main. They there arrived at an understanding relative to the allotment of military expenses, if, as seemed probable, a war should speedily become necessary. The Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse were solemnly appointed chiefs of the League. Thus, by the close of the year 1531, the alliance of the Evangelicals was thoroughly established and equipped.

It was now decreed that the Imperial Diet should convene at Nuremberg instead of at Speier. Before the Schmalkaldic allies repaired to the former city, they thought it advisable first to hold an assembly of their own at Schweinfurt, in April 1532. The emperor again endeavoured to treat with the Protestants. He sent to them the Electors of Mentz and the Palatinate, through whom he had entered into negotiations with them in the preceding year. He commissioned his envoys to instruct the Evangelicals for the present to confine their innovations in religious matters within the limits set forth by the Augsburg Confession, and not to form alliances with the subjects of any other of the imperial Estates; he also desired the allies to forbid their theologians to preach outside of Protestant territories, to leave the jurisdictions of the Catholic bishops unmolested, and above all to recognise the election of Ferdinand as Roman king. Upon the stedfast refusal of the allies to comply with these requisitions, the envoys proposed to continue the negotiations at Nuremberg.

At the Diet of Nuremberg, which took place in the summer of 1532, the Protestants were designated as those "who had joined in the Confession of Augsburg," and thus were recognised as an actually existing party. Concerning the course to be pursued by the empire in regard to any who might in future adopt the Confession, there seemed, however, to be no certainty attainable. Luther, as before, advised the Protestants to meet the overtures of their opponents amicably.[1] He warned the Evangelical party against too precise a stipulation of the articles of peace,[2] and commended the result, as ever, to his "faithful and loving God." The Hessian theologians were less easily satisfied.

An agreement was finally concluded on the 23d of July 1532, and ratified on the 2d of August of the same year. This was the so-called Religious Peace of Nuremberg. Its terms included those only who had already professed their adoption of the Confession of Augsburg. The agreement might, indeed, more properly be styled a truce than a peace. It provided that until the occurrence of the promised council, which was to take place at the expiration of a year, or in case the council should not be held, until the next imperial recess, neither party should be guilty of any kind of violence towards the other on account of any difference in creed.[3] The emperor for his part promised to put a stop to every religious process which had been set on foot by the Attorney-General. Charles was delighted to arrive at such a conclusion of the matter, on account of the urgent need for vigorous action in regard to the Turks. The rigidly Catholic Estates, however, were anything but content. The Elector Joachim of Brandenburg hotly declared that "he would not on any condition

[1] See De Wette, iv. Nos. 1462 and 1463.

[2] "If we insist upon defining every particular so positively according to our own judgment, and refuse to trust all things in the matter to God and let Him work His will therein, the affair will come to no good, and the saying of Solomon will be verified for us: 'The wringing of the nose bringeth forth blood;' and, 'Whoso despiseth small things shall not attain unto greater.'"

[3] Literally, neither party should injure, wage war against, arrest, invade, or besiege the other.

consent to a peace with the Protestants; he would rather forfeit his dominions and his subjects, and lose his own life." Aleander also, the Papal legate, who desired nothing less than a strict prosecution of the Edict of Worms, protested against the peace. On the side of the Protestants, the Landgrave Philip evinced dissatisfaction with the treaty, and made bitter complaint against the Elector of Saxony. The latter, however, was at this time lying upon his deathbed, and could no longer attend to the affairs of the allies. He referred the landgrave and his complaints to John Frederick, the prince electoral. John the Stedfast departed this life on the 16th of August 1532.

Matters wore a gloomy aspect in Switzerland also at this time. The peace that was brought about in 1529 was of no long duration. Zwingle's melancholy gaze into the future, and the forebodings which he expressed to his friends, seemed to be justified.[1] The Abbey of St. Gall gave the proximate occasion for the resumption of hostilities. This abbey had long been under the protection, so-called, of the four cantons of Zurich, Lucerne, Glarus, and Schwytz, the recent difference in whose religious opinions could not fail to exert a prejudicial influence upon their common superintendence of this ancient Catholic sanctuary.[2] The old abbot, Francis Geissberger, had died before the outbreak of the first religious war. His death seemed to the two Reformed protectoral cantons, Zurich and Glarus, to furnish a fitting occasion for the suppression of the abbey, and their policy would have been to delay the appointment of a successor to Geissberger until such appointment should of itself appear superfluous. Instead, however, of pursuing such a course, they demanded point-blank that, unless the subsisting conventual arrangements could be proved to be in accordance with Scripture, the abbey should forthwith be suppressed and the buildings be devoted to secular purposes.

[1] See HOTTINGER, *l.c.* vii. pp. 348–355.

[2] The documents relating to this controversy may be found in the already cited archives of ESCHER and HOTTINGER.

The two Catholic cantons of Lucerne and Schwytz of course refused to accede to this proposal, and insisted upon the appointment of another abbot. Whilst the guardians of the abbey were thus at odds, its inmates, who had concealed the fact of their superior's death as long as possible; themselves proceeded to elect a new head; their choice fell upon Kilian Käufi, who, soon after his advancement to the abbacy, collected together the treasures of the cloister, and, in company with his monks, fled across the lake by night to Bregenz. Käufi afterwards received his investiture from the emperor, and was confirmed in his new dignity by Pope Clement. Arbitrary as this whole proceeding was on the part of the conventuals, the Reformed cantons were themselves by no means guiltless of an arbitrary encroachment on corporate rights; for not only did they refuse to recognise the abbot, on the ground that he had obtained his office surreptitiously, but they even took it upon themselves to release the inmates of the cloister from various burdens, in the hope of thus inclining them to the Evangelical faith, and they also appropriated the decorations of the cloister church for the benefit of the poor.

But it was not alone the differences relative to the Abbey of St. Gall that revived the flame of religious discord. The continuous increase of gospel confessors, the spread of the Reformation even in districts where opposition to it had been more lasting, exasperated the antagonists of reform. Their irritation was further augmented by the foreign alliances contracted by the Evangelicals. Not only had Zurich and Basel, as we have seen, undertaken an alliance with the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, who manifested an increasing disregard of the scruples entertained by Luther concerning union with the Reformed party, but negotiations were likewise pending with France and Venice.[1] The stipulation of the treaty of peace relative to mutual toleration at length began to be transgressed in various places.

[1] See ESCHER'S *Archiv*, i. pp. 273 sqq.; MÖRIKOFER, ii. pp. 261 sqq. The latter calls the league with Venice a "preposterous" affair.

In vain did Bern, which had stedfastly declined all foreign alliances, endeavour to preserve the peace; the last mediatory efforts of Glarus, Freiburg, Solothurn, and Appenzell were likewise abortive. War was declared by the interception of supplies on the part of the Evangelicals. On the 9th of October 1531 the five cantons took the field with eight thousand men. Upon the reception of this intelligence, an advance guard under the command of George Göldli moved from Zurich towards Cappel, and was subsequently followed by the main body of troops. The first engagement took place on the 11th of October. I refrain from a description of the encounter as foreign to the purpose of this history, and invite attention instead to Zwingle alone, who was to be discovered among the foremost of the combatants. He it was who up to the last moment had counselled war, and it was just that he should not withdraw himself from the conflict. He seemed to have a presentiment that his body would remain on the field, for as he went forth with frequent and fervent prayer, bearing the banner of the canton, "he conversed with his intimate associates in such terms as made it evident that he had no expectation of ever seeing his home again." The fact that when he was about to mount, his horse retreated several paces, was regarded by his anxious friends as an evil omen.[1] When the enemy began their charge, and while Zwingle was standing in the foremost rank amid the bravest of his fellow-combatants, Leonard Burkhard said to him, "This is a bitter mess that is set before us, Master Ulrich! Who will eat it?"[2] "I," replied Zwingle, "and many an honest man beside, who stands here in the hand of God,

[1] Hottinger (vii. p. 372) instances a parallel case in the life of Mungo Park, whose horse stumbled at the commencement of the traveller's second journey to Africa, which occurrence Walter Scott held to be ominous. An equally striking circumstance may be cited from the life of Napoleon, whose horse stumbled and threw its rider before his passage over the Niemen. Sec. Ségur, *Histoire de Napoléon et de la grande armée*, vol. i. p. 142: "A voice exclaimed, 'That is a bad omen. A Roman would go back.'"

[2] "Master Ulrich, how are you pleased with this matter? Are the radishes salt enough? Who will eat them?" (Nüscheler, p. 221).

whose we are whether we live or die." He also spoke words of encouragement to Captain Lavater and others who were standing near. "My brave men," said he, "be of good cheer and fear not. Though we should suffer, our cause is still a good one. Commend yourselves to God, who is able to take care of us and of our dear ones. May He have them in His keeping!" A fierce conflict now began. According to an ancient Swiss custom, stones were employed by the combatants, in addition to the ordinary weapons of warfare. One of these missiles struck Zwingle as he stood in the neighbourhood of a pear-tree, and levelled him to the earth, just as he was administering consolation to one who had been stricken down a few moments before. Zwingle, as he fell, supported himself on his knees for an instant, exclaiming, "The body they may kill, but not the soul," and then sank backwards and lay with folded hands and eyes upturned to heaven.[1] His lips moved in silent prayer. In this condition he was found by some adherents of the old faith, who asked him if he would like to confess and if he desired to see a priest; they also admonished him to call upon the saints. Zwingle replied by shaking his head. "Die, then, obstinate heretic!" indignantly exclaimed Captain Vockinger[2] of Unterwalden, and gave him, at the same time, his death-stroke.

Though the accounts of Zwingle's departure may differ as to detail, it is certain that he died the death of a hero and was found among heroes; six hundred men of Zurich alone were left upon the battle-field, among whom were representatives of the noble races of Escher and Meiss. It is said that even in death Zwingle's countenance preserved the hue of health and vigour, looking as he had been wont to look in the pulpit, when delivering one of his most animated discourses. Tears flowed from the eyes of his friends who recognised him. A malignant joy was depicted on the faces of some of his antagonists, but the behaviour of others indicated that they

[1] Others state that he fell face downwards.

[2] By some this name is written *Fuchinger*.

were free from so base a sentiment. Hans Schönbrunner, formerly superior of the convent at Cappel, could not refrain from tears as he gazed on the form of Zwingle. "Whatever," said he, "may have been thy creed, I know that thou wast a loyal confederate. May God have mercy on thy soul." The most savage of the foes of the Evangelicals vehemently demanded that the corpse of Zwingle should be dismembered. Magistrate Golder and Amman Thos of Zug replied to this proposal as follows: "Let the dead rest. We are not yet at the end of this matter. God will judge those that have fallen." Such voices of moderation failed, however, to obtain a hearing. A trial was held over Zwingle's dead body, which was condemned as that of a heretic. It was then quartered by the executioner of Lucerne, the pieces were burned, and the ashes mingled with those of swine. But the heart of the great Reformer was saved. Thomas Plater is said to have snatched it from the flames and to have presented it to Zwingle's friend Myconius at Zurich as a sacred relic. It is related that the latter, who shortly afterwards removed to Basel, threw it into the Rhine, in order to avoid making it the object of a superstitious veneration; such a proceeding would seem to be an evidence of great zeal rather than of tender friendship. But, happily, the authenticity of the story is not vouched for.[1]

That the adherents of the old faith regarded the defeat of Zwingle as a righteous judgment of God, is a circumstance that cannot surprise us, nor can we blame them for entertaining such an opinion. But when we find Luther taking up the same strain of exultation, and again ranking Zwingle with Münzer, we cannot fail to be both surprised and grieved.[2]

A fate similar to Zwingle's overtook the valiant Commander Schmid, who was found dead on the field of battle, surrounded by thirteen of the members of his commandery; his remains,

[1] See MYCONIUS, *De Vita et Obitu Zwinglii*, at the conclusion.
[2] See Luther's Letters, DE WETTE, iv. Nos. 1429, 1430.

however, received worthy burial at the hands of friends.[1] And, alas for the many others who fell as sacrifices in this battle! who can count them? Jerome Botanus, the faithful and zealous assistant of Œcolampadius, perished in a subsequent engagement. And so fell many more.

We do not describe in detail the fight at Gubel, which took place on the next day, when the auxiliaries of the Reformed had arrived. Such a recital would be the less edifying, as it would be impossible to disguise the fact that the events which transpired were of such a nature as to reflect little honour upon the Reformed troops. The disorder manifest in the Evangelical army, its lack of military discipline and thirst for plunder,—an appetite which the Bernese satisfied by the sack of the cloister of Muri,—are characteristics which do not impress us with the idea of a host that was battling for the treasures of religion, for the cause of God; while the Catholics at least were fighting for their saints, for their altars, and their homes. It is thus, however, that it was to be. It was—in a melancholy way, it is true—to be impressed upon the mind of the Evangelical party, that the interests of truth are not to be advanced by material weapons; that the cause of the Divine Son of man is not to be defended by the sword. In the fate of Zwingle, however, and his heroic death, a highly tragical element is discernible; that fate and death set forth the fact that the very noblest and best of humanity may, by a fatality of circumstances, be drawn into undertakings which exceed the limits previously calculated upon, and for the results of which the mover in them can consequently not be held responsible. Admitting, if you will, that Zwingle was in error in thinking to force concessions by the might of the sword, where Luther based his hopes upon the foundation of

[1] "Oswald Sägesser, a conventual of Küssnacht, and also a preacher of the word of God, had the body of Schmid conveyed from the battle-field of Küssnacht, where it was interred in the charnel-house of the chapel of St. Nicholas" (*Zür. Neujahrsbl.* p. 14). BULLINGER writes concerning him: "This Conrad Schmid was a pious man and a great help to the cause of Reform, as may be seen in the chronicles," etc.

the divine word alone, we still contend that Zwingle's was a noble error, and one which, associated as it was with a sacred enthusiasm for the cause of right and truth, is far more pardonable and infinitely higher than that subtile Erasmian prudence that always scents danger afar off and skilfully evades it. It must be considered, moreover, that the position which Zwingle occupied was very different from that of Luther, the former being at once a Reformer and Republican.

Zwingle was cut down in the summer of his days, in the midst of many and manifold activities. In considering his career, the thought forces itself upon us, How much more might this man have accomplished for the Church, for learning, for his city and his country, if his life had been prolonged! How many traits in his own character might have been clarified, and moulded into a harmonious whole! Nevertheless, he was, just *as* he was, a whole man; and that which he was permitted to accomplish, succeeding generations have honoured, and will continue to honour, all the more gratefully because his time was so short. The great improvements which he effected in the schools of his native canton, and his promotion of good order and morality in his vicinity, have been set forth in detail by others.[1] His literary labours have been already referred to by us at various times, in connection with different events in his life. A comprehensive exhibition of his merits as an expositor of Scripture and a religious teacher cannot be expected here. It will suffice for us to mention two of his writings, from one of which his doctrinal system may be gathered in greatest fulness; the other was written shortly before his death, and has been termed by Bullinger his "Swan Song." Both were dedicated to Francis I., king of France. The first, the *Commentary on True and False Religion*,[2] was written in the year 1525, and

[1] See especially MÖRIKOFER, in various passages.

[2] *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* (*Opp.* iii. pp. 145 sqq.), translated into German by Leo Juda.

bears the motto, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you." With philosophical clearness and dignity, and yet with religious warmth and earnestness, Zwingle here discusses the essence of religion—a task of reflection which Luther would never have imposed upon himself. Religion is apprehended as the sum total of piety, as the bond that unites us to God. Religion, it is stated, essentially consists in attachment (*adhæsio*) to God as the one true good, and in the endeavour to do the will of the Most High. In this definition, however, Zwingle is far from contemplating only that which has since been called *natural* religion. True religion and true Christianity coincide in his estimation. All spiritual health, he maintains, comes from Christ. Zwingle calls no man a Christian [in the eminent sense of the term] save him who places his whole confidence in God alone and not in any creature, and hopes in God's mercy through Christ His Son;[1] who fashions himself after the example of Christ; who dies daily, denies himself daily, and whose whole endeavour is to suffer nothing in himself that can offend his God. Hence the Christian life is a conflict both difficult and dangerous, that cannot be intermitted without injury to the soul that has undertaken it, but for which a glorious victory is in prospect; for he who battles here, shall be crowned hereafter, if he forsake not Christ, his Head.

The second and shorter of the two writings to which reference is had, the *Brief and Clear Exposition of Faith*,[2] was composed at the suggestion of Maigret, the French ambassador, and introduced at the court of France through Collin's instrumentality. It was designed to refute the malicious slanders which, in France as elsewhere, were continually being disseminated against the confessors of the gospel. The most recent biography of Zwingle calls this the "purest and freest of his writings."[3] Zwingle does not permit himself to be

[1] In the passage referred to, Zwingle calls Christ "God of God" (*Deus de Deo*).
[2] *Christianæ fidei brevis et clara expositio* (*Opp.* iv. p. 42).
[3] MÖRIKOFER, ii. p. 334.

disturbed by the calumnies of the foes of the Evangelicals. Their falsehoods serve but as foils to heighten the brilliancy of the truth. At the head of his Confession appears the proposition that has been called the chief fundamental tenet of the Zwinglian theology,—viz., that the eternal, uncreated God is the only worthy object of our adoration and worship, the alone sufficient ground of our confidence. By this assertion he rejects the worship of the saints and the Virgin Mary, though he holds the latter in high honour and does not refuse her the appellation of "mother of God" (*Dei para*). In like manner the sacraments, as external things, are declared unworthy of veneration. Neither the invocation of the saints nor the use of the sacraments is instrumental in securing the forgiveness of our sins, which can be obtained from God alone. In the surrender of the Son of God, Zwingle sees the strongest demonstration of the divine compassion for sinful humanity.

The doctrinal discussions which Zwingle incorporates in this work, we touch upon but slightly. A religious feeling is manifest throughout them. To the last he remained faithful to his doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, inasmuch as he continued to deny, in the writing to which we are at present referring, the corporeal presence of Christ in the bread. His view of the sacrament had deepened, however, as is evident from the fact that the idea of a spiritual participation therein is brought forward more distinctly and prominently here than at the beginning of the Eucharistic controversy. Nevertheless, he still continues to regard trust in Christ Himself as the all-important matter. As bread sustains human life, and as wine makes man cheerful, so Christ restores the soul that was formerly destitute of all hope—He sustains and cheers it. It is *faith* that makes us capable of receiving the bread not as mere bread, but in its higher signification,[1] according to which Christ is made

[1] *Qui jam non panis, sed Christus est significatione.* An ideal transformation, such as was taught in the ancient Church.

present to us. Not only this communion with the Lord, but also the communion of Christians with one another, is set forth by Zwingle as a special blessing attendant upon the Lord's Supper. As bread is produced through the mingling of many grains of wheat, and as wine is made by a confluence of juice from many grapes, so the body of the Church is formed of an infinite number of members, being made through *one* faith in Christ, which faith is the product of *one* Spirit, a temple of the Holy Ghost.[1]

For the benefit of the king, Zwingle endeavours to set forth the relation of faith to works very plainly. Faith he regards as that religious disposition which confers value upon external actions. Where faith is lacking, there is a decrease in the value of the act performed. God can take pleasure in such works only as proceed from faith. In like manner, says Zwingle, the king would look with distrust upon the finest work that any one could execute for him, if he knew that it was not the offspring of faith, *i.e.* of an honest and loyal disposition; he would suspect that it covered some perfidy, some egotistical design. It is in this sense, he concludes, that we must apprehend the saying, "What is not of faith is sin."

In the section on eternal life, there is one passage that gave offence to some persons—to Luther especially—at the time when it was written, and which has since Zwingle's day shocked a great number of orthodox people. When the Reformer directs the king to the contemplation of eternity, he refers not only to the pious of the Old and New Covenants, to the old and the new Adam (Christ), to the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, — not merely even to the pious ancestors of the king, from Saint Louis onward, and backward to the Pepins,—but he also mentions among the blessed of the other world, Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Numa, Camillus, the Catos, and the Scipios. "In

[1] The doctrine of the Eucharist is discussed at still greater length in the Appendix.

short," he continues, "no upright man has ever lived, no pious heart, no faithful soul has ever existed, from the beginning to the end of the world, whom thou wilt not see yonder in the presence of God.".

The mention of mythological personages in this connection is attributable to the Humanistic bent of Zwingle's mind; nor should any one insist upon calling the author of the above-cited lines to as rigorous an account, in such a poetico-rhetorical flight of fancy, as if he were engaged in the statement of some dogmatical proposition. However we regard the words, they bear witness to the large-hearted liberality of the Reformer.

It is unnecessary for me to describe the impression which the news of the defeat at Cappel produced at Zurich. I shall say nothing of those who bewailed fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers among the slain; nothing of Zwingle's widow, to whose manifold and grievous losses I have before alluded. But when to such calamities as the above, the pain of being misunderstood is superadded,—when the suffering of loss is followed by reproaches concerning things that it is not in the power of man alone to avert,—the grief of the afflicted is doubled. Such was the case at Zurich after the battle of Cappel. The measures of the Government were then most bitterly censured, and great blame was cast upon Zwingle and other preachers, who, it was declared, had fanaticized the people by their discourses, and seduced them to rash and hazardous undertakings. Many a man who before had, perhaps, been loudest in his carpings at the Government for not displaying a more courageous spirit, now accused the rulers of fool-hardiness, and declared that he had foreseen the unfortunate issue of the enterprise from the outset. Many another, however, buried his grief in his own bosom, thinking, it may be, that he would best honour the memory of the fallen, if, in fidelity and obedience to evangelical truth, he learned to humble himself under the mighty hand of God.

Both parties had now become weary of a war in which, literally speaking, brother fought against brother;[1] winter came on and disinclined either side to longer sojourn in the field. On the 16th of November a second religious peace was accordingly concluded at Teynikon, in the canton of Zug. It is needless for us to specify the various conditions of this peace; suffice it to say that the leading stipulation was mutual tolerance. The costs of the war were settled by arbitration.[2]

Let us now glance for a moment at the disturbed condition of affairs in Solothurn. In that city, as we have already seen, the majority had clung to the Catholic faith; notwithstanding this, however, a Reformed party of no inconsiderable strength had arisen, and had obtained permission to hold a weekly service in the church of the Franciscans, from which, also, the images and decorations were removed. Berthold Haller, of Bern, had likewise been invited to spend some time in the city, and measures were taken for a religious conference. But when, from anxiety at these innovations, the image of St. Ursus began to sweat, the Catholics, regarding this artifice of the priests as a miracle, formed the more earnest resolutions to put a stop to heresy. Such was the aspect of affairs at the outbreak of the war. In the country, the evangelical faith had a larger number of adherents. Both from the country and the city, troops were despatched to Cappel in aid of the Reformed. After peace was declared, the five cantons demanded that Solothurn should either pay eight hundred crowns as its share in defraying the expenses of the war, or take measures for the suppression of the religious services of the Reformed wherever they had been introduced. The Catholics very naturally chose the latter alternative, and preparations were made for the forcible expulsion of the adherents of the new faith from Solothurn.

[1] This was the case with the two Göldlis.

[2] For particulars, see BULLINGER, vol. iii.; HOTTINGER, *l.c.* pp. 422 sqq.; and MÖRIKOFER, ii. p. 443.

Matters at length arrived at such a crisis that the Catholics stationed themselves with a loaded cannon in front of the house where the Reformed held their meetings. Thereupon Mayor Nicholas Wenge took his stand before the mouth of the cannon, exclaiming, "If burgher blood is to be shed, let mine flow first!" This resolute act produced a powerful impression throughout the city. Recourse to arms was thus prevented, but the Reformed party sustained defeat here also; indeed, from the day of the battle of Cappel, a reaction of no little strength set in, in various districts of Switzerland, in favour of Catholicism.

Zwingle was soon followed by other leaders of the Reformation. The Bernese Reformer Francis Kolb, the coadjutor of Haller, and a correspondent of Zwingle's, was at the battle of Cappel in the capacity of chaplain; he also had uttered many words of rebuke, ill received by those to whom they were addressed. He did not fall in the battle, nor did he die of wounds there received, but of a broken heart[1] some years later (1535).

Œcolampadius, who had kept aloof from the battle-field, did not long survive his friend Zwingle. The news of the death of the latter so powerfully affected him, weighed down as he was with the cares of his office, as to occasion a severe shock to his already shattered health. A malignant inflammatory disorder[2] hastened his end, which was worthy of his life. On the 21st of November, he said to his family: "Do not grieve, my beloved! I am not leaving you for ever. I am but passing from this vale of sorrow to the better and eternal life. I ought to rejoice at the thought that I shall soon be in the abode of everlasting bliss." He then partook

[1] See BULLINGER, iii. pp. 213 and 263.

[2] On the nature of his disease (*anthrax in osse sacro*), and still more on his lovely Christian departure, compare the letter of his friend and colleague, Simon Grynæus, to Wolfgang Capito. This letter is inserted as the narrative of an eye-witness, *De vita et obitu Œcolampadii*, in the preface to the edition of Œcolampadius' *Commentary on Ezekiel* (Argent. 1534), iv.; it may also be found in the *Epp. Zwinglii et Œc.* Comp. HERZOG, *Œcolampad.* ii. pp. 246 sqq.

of the Lord's Supper in company with his wife, their relatives, and household servants. "This holy supper," he observed, "is a token of my true faith in Christ Jesus, my Lord, my Saviour, and my Redeemer; it is a faithful token of love, left us by Him. Let it be my last farewell to you." On the following day he assembled his colleagues about his bed and besought them to seek the welfare of the Church. He reminded them of the salvation purchased for us by Christ, admonished them to walk in His footprints, and to be the more loyal in their love to Him and to those for whom He died in the increasing darkness and turbulence of the times. He charged them to be his witnesses that he had had the prosperity of the Church at heart, and had not, as his enemies declared, been its seducer to apostasy. His colleagues grasped him by the hand and solemnly promised to cherish the interest of the Church. The day before his death, he had his children brought to him, and told them to love God, their heavenly Father; he also charged their mother and other relatives to be careful that the children harmonized in character with their significant names (Eusebius, Aletheia, Irene), that they might grow up pious, truthful, and peaceable. The last night of his life now approached. All the clergy were assembled about his bed. Of a friend who came in, he inquired whether he brought him any news; on receiving a negative answer, he pleasantly remarked: "Then I will tell you something new; I shall soon be with the Lord Christ." When he was asked if the light annoyed him, he pointed to his heart, saying, "Here is light enough." The day was just breaking when, with the sigh, "Lord Jesus, help me!" Œcolampadius breathed his last. The ten clergymen who were present had fallen on their knees, and accompanied the parting soul with silent prayers. Thus, on the 24th of November 1531,[1] Œcolampadius passed away, at the age of

[1] Concerning the date of his death, about which there is some difference of opinion (it being variously given as 21st and 23d November and 1st December), see HERZOG, *l.c.* p. 252, note.

forty-nine. His grave is in the cathedral, close to that of the Burgomaster Jacob Meyer and that of Simon Grynæus. Foolish stories concerning his death were spread abroad by his religious opponents;[1] to these idle tales, we regret to say, Luther lent an ear.

The character of Œcolampadius is neither as imposing as Luther's nor as energetic as Zwingle's. He reminds us more of Melanchthon, although he did not attain to his greatness. Still, though he must be classed with the Reformers of the second rank, he filled with honour the position assigned him by God. He may more fitly be compared with the fathers of the Church than with the prophets; and such a comparison would be the more apposite, since the study of the patristic writings was advanced by him. His preaching, though not remarkably powerful in its style, was calculated to produce a permanent effect upon its hearers. His most conspicuous virtue was fidelity to God and man. He frequently repeated the saying, that no man who had laid his hand to the plough should look back; and in accordance with that sentiment he lived and laboured. The high estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries is evident from the fact that he was called to Zurich to succeed Zwingle. He became his successor in another sense.

Zwingle's position was assumed by Henry Bullinger—that of Œcolampadius by Oswald Myconius. Both of these men deserve our attention for a few moments.

Henry Bullinger was the son of Dean Bullinger of Bremgarten,[2] whom we have already mentioned in connection with

[1] A Lucerne manuscript relates that he laid violent hands on himself, from chagrin at the issue of the battle of Cappel. The malicious Cochlæus caused it to be reported that he had been carried off by Satan.

[2] In spite of the law of celibacy, the elder Bullinger lived with Anna Wiederkehr in a matrimonial connection which was certainly not sanctioned by the Church. Such conscientious marriages were not unfrequently contracted by "the purer and more earnest-minded" of the priests of that period. See SAL. HESS, *Lebensgeschichte Bullingers*, ii., Zurich, 1828-29; and KARL PESTALOZZI, *Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*, Elberfeld, 1858 (vol. v. of the *Väter und Begründer*).

Samson, the seller of indulgences. After receiving his first scanty instruction in the school of his native place, Henry, when twelve years old, was sent to Emmerich, in the Netherlands, to be educated by the "Brethren of the Common Life." By them he was introduced to the study of the classics. The discipline in the "Beehive" (the name by which the house of the Brethren was known) was exceedingly severe. The inmates were permitted to speak nothing but Latin. Like Luther at Eisenach, Bullinger was obliged to earn his bread at Emmerich by singing from door to door. In common with the Saxon Reformer, furthermore, he believed that he would please God by entering one of the monastic orders. He accordingly resolved to choose the strictest of them all—that of the Carthusian monks. He, however, did not, like Luther, consummate his purpose. At the University of Cologne, Bullinger not only became familiar with the writings of the church fathers and the Schoolmen, but at this very seat of the "obscurants" he made acquaintance with the productions of Luther and Melanchthon. The *Loci Communes* of the latter (see chapter vii.) impressed him most deeply. From this time (which was in the years 1521 and 1522) he devoted himself to an earnest study of the Bible. In April 1522, after having passed six years in the Rhine provinces, he returned to quiet Bremgarten. In the Cistercian monastery of Cappel, which was near his native place, he obtained, at the beginning of the year 1523, under the auspices of the pious and enlightened abbot, Wolfgang Joner (surnamed Rüppli), employment as teacher in the school connected with the cloister. To the boys he explained the Latin classics (Cicero, Sallust, and Virgil), and at the same time daily delivered theological lectures to adults on the writings of Erasmus and Melanchthon. These lectures were attended not only by the abbot and the monks, but admission was also offered to every one in the vicinity. Departing from the prevalent custom of employing Latin for all literary purposes, Bullinger lectured in his native German. His reformatory

sentiments soon became evident. Instead, however, of their alienating from him the abbot, who was a strict churchman, the latter was more and more won over to the doctrine of the gospel. Between the reverend dignitary of more than fifty winters and the schoolmaster of nineteen, a lovely brotherly relation sprang up. The circle of Bullinger's intimates likewise included the prior of the cloister, Peter Simmler of Rheinau, the distinguished priest Wernher Steiner of Zug, and others. The report of Bullinger's teachings and of the abbot's sanction thereof brought the cloister under suspicion of heresy among the friends of the ancient order of things; nor were there wanting among these some who played the part of spies upon the monastery and its inmates.

While attending the religious conferences at Zurich, Bullinger contracted a friendship with Zwingle, whose sermons had already made a lasting impression on him. Though independent research and the study of the writings of Luther and Melanchthon had, without Zwingle's mediation, resulted for Bullinger in a clearer insight into divine truth, it must necessarily have afforded him great delight to meet with a confirmation of his principles from the great Swiss Reformer. Zwingle's "forcible, sound, and scriptural teachings," Bullinger declares, "greatly strengthened my convictions." During the remainder of Zwingle's life, each of these two men formed the complement of the other, as was the case with Luther and Melanchthon. While Bullinger was still at Cappel, where he remained for six years, he manifested great fecundity as an author. Upwards of seventy different treatises flowed from his pen. The chief purport of these writings was always that the supreme authority in matters of faith is to be met with in the Holy Scriptures, and that the sum of all salvation and blessedness is to be found in Christ. He likewise strove to confirm others in these principles.[1] Independently of the Eucharistic controversy between Luther and the Swiss Reformers,

[1] See Bullinger's letter to Pastor Matthias at Seengen on the Hallwylersee, PESTALOZZI, p. 31.

and purely in view of the Romish mass, Bullinger in 1525, the same year in which the controversy broke out, espoused the same views in regard to the Lord's Supper which were defended by Zwingle and Œcolampadius against Luther and his adherents.[1]

Bullinger likewise assisted Zwingle in opposing the Anabaptists. He also became the friend of Œcolampadius. After the reform of the cloister of Cappel had been effected, Bullinger (in 1527) married Anna Adlischweiler of Zurich, formerly a nun in the convent of Oetenbach, which, like that of Cappel, had, at the time of which we speak, been suppressed. For the edification and instruction of his wife, Bullinger (in 1528) wrote a treatise "Concerning Female Education, and how a Daughter should order her Life and Conduct."[2] The behaviour of Bullinger exerted a reflex influence upon his father, the Dean of Bremgarten, who was still living, and who, in a sermon delivered in February 1529, now declared himself positively in favour of the Reformation. The people of Bremgarten were divided in their religious sentiments. The adherents of Rome succeeded in deposing

[1] For the benefit of Anna Schwiter, a simple burgheress of Zug, he wrote a treatise "Against the bread of idols, and concerning the bread of thanksgiving; how manifold the abuse thereof is, and what is the just and true use of it" In regard to transubstantiation, he would not accept the argument so frequently drawn from the divine omnipotence, declaring that all manner of absurdities might with equal justice be defended by the assertion that all things are possible to God. According to this mode of argumentation, an ox must be able to fly. The body of Christ enclosed in the bread, he regarded as on a par with a god contained in a pyx, in the monstrance, or in any shrine or receptacle whatever. A "Christ of bread" he rated no higher than a wooden Jupiter or a brazen Mars. Thus, before Bullinger became acquainted with Luther's view, he combated impanation as well as transubstantiation. The two doctrines were held by him to be on an equal footing. The latter he attacked with great sharpness and excessive bitterness, in the following words:—"We snatch the body of Christ from heaven, whither it is ascended, and drag it about as we choose; we chase it, to the sound of a bell, from one temple to another, from one village or farmhouse to another, and for every one who comes to us we can make a God." That such utterances must wound many pious minds, and that such and similar statements might displease even deeper natures, such as Luther's, every unprejudiced person must admit.

[2] On the cover were the words: "This little book and its contents pertain only to my wife."

the aged dean,[1] but the reformatory party indemnified themselves for this triumph of their opponents by calling the schoolmaster of Cappel, the son of the deposed clergyman, to be their preacher. With this circumstance was connected the prosecution of the Reformation in Bremgarten, the abolition of the mass and of images. Hence we may call Bullinger the Reformer of this little town, which, by its geographical position, formed an outpost in that struggle which was to be decided on the field of Cappel. Bullinger shared in the sad experiences of the war. On the occasion of the general Diet at Bremgarten (August 1531), he exerted all the powers of his eloquence in the endeavour to depict before the eyes of the assembled confederates the horrors of intestine war. He warned them against precipitancy. Not with the sword, but with the weapons of the Spirit, would he have the conflict decided. On this point he was in full sympathy with Luther. Again, on the 10th of August, in the presence of the two deputies from Bern, he had an earnest interview with Zwingle in the parsonage at Bremgarten, and at its close accompanied his friend to the next village. Zwingle took leave of him three times, with tears in his eyes, and said to him, "My dear Henry, may God preserve you. Be faithful to the Lord Christ and to His Church." This was the last time that the two ever saw each other. The unfortunate issue of the battle of Cappel operated disastrously upon Bremgarten. The dismissal of its preachers was imposed upon it by the unhappy treaty of peace which succeeded the battle. In the night of the 20th and 21st November 1531, Bullinger, in company with his aged but still vigorous father, and his colleague, Gervasius Schuler, set out for Zurich. He was followed, a few days later, by his brave wife, who was obliged to fight her way through the guards at the gate of Bremgarten. The fugitives were hospitably received by Werner Steiner, who, having been driven from Zug some time before on account of his faith, had taken up his abode at Zurich, in the neighbourhood of the

[1] He, however, speedily found another charge in a neighbouring parish.

minster. The spirit of mingled despondency and irritation which at this time prevailed in that deeply-humiliated city, entered unpleasantly into the personal experience of Steiner. Any man who bore the title of "parson" was looked upon with suspicion by either side; for the idea had become rife that all the calamities under which the burghers were at present groaning, owed their origin to priests and preachers. Even Leo Juda found it necessary to conceal himself, with the aid of faithful friends; and the schoolmaster, Oswald Myconius, scarcely dared show himself in the street when engaged in the pursuit of his harmless avocation. But Bullinger, who was then in the vigour of youth (he was twenty-seven years old), did not permit himself to be discouraged. He made his appearance in the pulpit, and spoke words of encouragement to the troubled Evangelicals. It seemed to many as if Zwingle had risen again in this new phœnix. What, then, could be more natural than that Bullinger should be chosen as the successor of the slain Reformer? On the 9th of December 1531, he was unanimously appointed to the rectorship of the cathedral by the whole of the Greater Council.[1] At his election it had been declared to him that the people desired a peace-loving preacher —one who would "proclaim the word of God in a virtuous, friendly, and Christian manner," and would not meddle with secular affairs. Bullinger accepted this condition, with the proviso that the word of God should in no wise be bound thereby. He, however, assumed only the pastoral office of Zwingle. The theological professorship was conferred upon the learned Buchanan (Bibliander).

Bullinger's position was by no means an easy one. The anti-reformatory party, which now numbered among its adherents many who had formerly professed attachment to the new doctrine, had taken advantage of the dejection of the civil authorities to involve them in reactionary measures. All

[1] His friends styled him *Antistes* in their letters, but this had not yet become the customary title. See PESTALOZZI, *l.c.* p. 79.

manner of movements were under way on the borders of the Lake of Zurich. Immediately after the battle of Cappel, in November 1531, a public meeting had been held at Meilen, on the eastern shore of the lake. A complaint was presented to the Government, requesting the abolition of innovations. It was demanded that the "interloping parsons who had flocked" to the canton should be cast adrift, and that peace-loving pastors should be installed in their places. Some few in the city of Zurich returned to the old faith. Peter Füssli, a member of the council, visited Einsiedeln at Easter 1532, for the purpose of confessing. Mass was secretly celebrated in a cellar. Rome seized the favourable opportunity now offered to her, and, through her legate Ennius, invited the Government to return to the bosom of the ancient Catholic Church. On the Wednesday after Trinity Sunday 1532, the Government, it is true, issued a fresh mandate against the mass, and therein promised "confidently to abide" by the truth as once discerned,[1] but the efficiency of its measures was much diminished by a reactionary party. On St. John's day of this same year, Leo Juda, who had been for so long a time the assistant of Zwingle, delivered a cutting sermon (in a style suggestive of John the Baptist, whom the day commemorated), in which he accused the Government of no less a thing than treason to the truth and adulteration of the faith. "Ye," he declared, addressing himself to the rulers, "are shepherds of God's flock, and as such it is incumbent upon you to guard your sheep, that God has entrusted to you, from wolves, whatever detriment may ensue to yourselves. Ye should not suffer them to be damaged in honour, body, or estate; much less ought ye to permit their souls to suffer injury, or allow them to be despoiled of any particle of divine truth. He who flees when the wolf attacks the flock is not a faithful shepherd. And now since ye, the shepherds of the people, are sleeping, *I* must do *my* duty,—I must bark like the shepherd's watchful dog, and arouse you. Ye" (he proceeded

[1] BULLINGER, iii. pp. 315 sqq.

further) "have ejected from the council pious and upright men, honourable citizens, good old burghers of Zurich, who have always acted with fidelity towards the word of God and the State. Ye have called them clamourers when they lifted up their voices against you. On the other hand, men whom aforetime ye punished for adultery and other misdeeds, declaring them to have forfeited their honour, ye now have again elevated to an honourable standing, have advanced them to preferment, and placed them on the judicial bench and in the council." This discourse of "Master Leu" [Lion] occasioned much commotion. The matter was taken before the Council of Two Hundred. Besides Leo, Bullinger was summoned to appear before this body, he having expressed himself in similar terms. The defence of the two men was so fraught with power and dignity that the Government not only dismissed them uncensured, but even requested them to continue to proclaim the word of God as they had done hitherto. It was added further, that if the preachers should at some future time be desirous of laying any complaint before the Government, they were at liberty to go and "knock at the door of the council chamber, when admission would at once be granted them."

Ennius, seeing that he could not prevail upon the Government of Zurich to abandon the evangelical faith, endeavoured to kindle the wrath of the Catholic cantons afresh. For this purpose he availed himself of the mandate against the mass, issued by the rulers of Zurich. In this mandate the sacrifice of the mass was called a diminution of the merit of Christ—language which the opposite party construed into a violation of the treaty of peace, by the provisions of which each party was forbidden to speak insultingly of the religion of the other. Hence fresh negotiations arose between Zurich and the five cantons, continuing until the matter was finally settled in April 1533.

Oswald Myconius,[1] the successor of Œcolampadius at Basel,

[1] Melchior Kirchhofer, *Oswald Myconius, Antistes der Basler Kirche*, Zurich, 1813; and the author's *Leben Œcolampads und Myconius*, Elberfeld, 1859.

was more favourably situated than was Bullinger at Zurich. Myconius, whose real name was Geisshüsler, was born at Lucerne in the year 1488; the exact day of his birth is unknown. After completing his studies at Basel, he was for some time a schoolmaster in that city. On returning to Lucerne, he, together with Xylotectus (Zimmermann) and Jodocus Kilchmeyer, gave expression to reformatory sentiments, in consequence of which he was obliged to leave the city in 1523.[1] After a brief sojourn at Einsiedeln, he accepted a call from Zwingle to the foundation school of the Frauenmünster at Zurich. In a school he was in his true element. Thomas Plater, of the Valais, whose originality of mind we have already had occasion to mention, was his pupil, his intellectual son. In addition to teaching, Myconius sometimes preached, and further took part in the general religious conflict by his writings. Upon one occasion he defended the people of Zurich against the attacks of the priesthood of Inner Switzerland.[2] On the death of Zwingle, he left Zurich and removed to Basel. In the latter city he was at first pastor of St. Alban's, thus filling a vacancy occasioned by the death of Jerome Botanus;[3] at the decease of Œcolampadius, however, he was advanced to the chief pastorate of Basel. In August 1532 he was also created professor of the New Testament. In his modesty he declined the title of Doctor, on the plea that Christ forbade His disciples to be called Rabbi (Matt. xxiii. 8), saying that one is their Master, and all they are brethren. A special chair had accordingly to be established for the degreeless teacher.

We can here no longer follow Myconius' efforts in the cause of ecclesiastical reform. Be it observed only, that it was under his leadership that the Confession of the Church of Basel, a sketch of which had been prepared by Œcolampadius,

[1] See chap. xiv.

[2] *Oswaldi Myconii, Lucernani ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ, qui Tigurinis male loquuntur suasoria, ut male loque desinant.*

[3] This faithful colleague of Œcolampadius was one of those who fell in the battle of Cappel.

was finally completed, and, by order of the Government, printed and published, and adopted by the burghers at the halls of the different guilds. This was *The First Confession of Basel*, of the year 1534;[1] under the name of *Mülhusana* it was also adopted by the neighbouring city of Mühlhausen. It is remarkable for its great simplicity and mildness. Its strongest opposition is called forth by the Anabaptists, who at that time were still regarded as a dangerous "rabble." How little the letter of this Confession was intended to be binding upon all future ages, is manifest from the conclusion, which is as follows:—"Finally, we would subject this our Confession to the verdict of the divine scriptures of the Bible; and we do hereby profess our readiness at any and every time most thankfully to render obedience to God and His word, if it shall be proved to us from Holy Writ that our doctrine is in any point erroneous."

[1] See the author's *Geschichte der Basler Confession*, Basel, 1828. The Confession consists of twelve articles. Article 1 treats of God (Trinity, election); article 2, of man (the fall, original sin); article 3, of God's care over us (divine revelation down to the coming of Christ); article 4, of Christ, true God and true man; article 5, of the Church and the sacraments; article 6, of the Lord's Supper (Christ the soul's nourishment unto eternal life: the body of Christ, however, not enclosed in the bread and wine of the sacrament); article 7, of the use of excommunication (the Church excommunicates in order to the reformation of the excommunicated person, and readmits him to its fellowship upon his repentance); article 8, of rulers; article 9, of faith and works; article 10, of the last day; article 11, of commandments and non-commandments (festivals, holy days, and the marriage of priests); article 12, against the Anabaptists.

CHAPTER XXV.

ROMANIC SWITZERLAND—WILLIAM FAREL—THE REFORMATION IN NEUCHATEL AND ITS VICINITY—PETER VIRET—BEGINNINGS OF THE REFORMATION IN VAUD—GENEVA AND ITS PARTIES—FAREL, SAUNIER, FROMENT, OLIVETANUS—VICTORY OF THE REFORMATION AT GENEVA.

WE have not yet spoken of that part of Switzerland which is collectively designated as Romanic or, in popular parlance, French Switzerland.[1] There, also, the conflict between the old and new, between priestly authority and independence of the spiritual yoke, had been in course of preparation. The man who first comes forth prominently as a Reformer of this portion of Switzerland is William Farel, whom we have lost sight of since the time when he challenged the University of Basel to a disputation (1524). He subsequently visited Strassburg, where he contracted a friendship with Capito and Bucer. In the early part of November 1526, after experiencing a variety of fortunes, Farel, on the advice of Haller of Bern, took up his abode at Aigle, in the lower valley of the Rhone, on the borders of Bern and Valais. He there laboured in the modest vocation of a schoolmaster, calling himself Ursinus, in allusion to the arms of Bern, under whose protection he stood. Œcolampadius, in a letter under date 27th December, congratulates him on his new office, and

[1] For information concerning the political history of this part of Switzerland, see VUILLEMIN, *Geschichte der Eidgenossen während des 16 und 17 Jahrhunderts* vol. viii. of JOH. VON MULLER'S *Geschichte der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft*), Zurich, 1842. For its ecclesiastical history, see RUCHAT, *Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse* (Vuillemin's edition). For biographies of Farel, see note on p. 330 of vol. i.

encourages him to proceed with equal firmness and discretion, looking to the Lord, who without doubt would show him the right way. Farel encountered great opposition. The local magistrates forbade him to preach, despite the permission which he had received from Bern. The Bishop of Sitten hurled the thunderbolt of excommunication against preachers who were vagabondizing about the country. Fanatical monks zealously opposed him. Farel, however, was not to be turned aside by any of these things. He preached, also, in the vicinity of Aigle, at Olon, Bex, and elsewhere. As he was holding forth one day at Olon, he was disturbed by a clamorous multitude with drums, etc. Raging women also fell upon him like furies, and plucked out his beard.

The favourable issue of the disputation at Bern (1528), which Farel personally attended, gave him courage to press forward. The mandate of reform was, however, by no means cheerfully received by the mass of the people. When posted on the church doors at Aigle, it was torn down by the populace. The disturbance was augmented when the lords of Bern forcibly removed altars and images. Farel was besieged in his pulpit by the raging mob. The Bernese Government sent a deputy, named Rudolph Nägeli, to restore peace and quiet to the district, but his efforts at first proved fruitless. The inhabitants of the valley of Ormond resisted the innovations with especial violence. They declared that they would choose another ruler rather than abandon their old faith. Bern gave them until Whitsuntide to consider their determination, and they finally discontinued their opposition. The Bernese Government executed summary vengeance on those who had been guilty of promoting insubordination. The chief men of the parish, who had favoured the disorders, were deposed; the vicar of the old church was banished from the place; and the benefices were given to evangelical preachers. The people by degrees became accustomed to the novelties which had been thus forced upon them.

Farel was by nature more fitted to be a travelling preacher

—a pioneer of the gospel—than a reformer quietly building away in one place. By the authorization of the Bernese magistracy, he went first to Murten [or Morat], and then to Biel, which latter town had some time previously accepted the doctrines of the Reformation, and for that reason welcomed him all the more gladly, desiring that he might confirm the minds of the Evangelicals in the truth. Thence he proceeded to Neureville, on the Lake of Biel.

Under commission of the Bernese Government, he next visited Lausanne. On the 31st of October 1529, he appeared before the council of that place, and presented his credentials as a preacher of the gospel. The matter was laid before the Council of Two Hundred, which body showed itself not unfavourably disposed towards Farel; but the bishop stedfastly resisted the Reformer. Farel returned for a time to Murten. He next directed his attention to the county of Neuchatel, and made his appearance first at Serrières, about half a mile from the city of Neuchatel. There was a priest at the former place who was not entirely disinclined to the gospel, and who permitted the wandering evangelist to preach in the churchyard. There Farel accordingly held forth, mounted upon a stone, which is still pointed out as a memento of those days. Burghers from Neuchatel appeared among his auditors, and finally invited him to visit their city. He accepted this call, and preached in the market-place, in the streets, and public squares. There was something striking in his appearance. The little insignificant man, with a red and touzled beard and sunburnt visage, but with eyes that shot lightning, and a voice of thunder, combined an audacious and defiant air with his neglected exterior. Some he repelled; others were attracted by him. While the monks cried shame upon him, the voice of the people was all the more urgent in requiring that he should speak. Novelty-seekers, as well as searchers after salvation, pressed upon the stranger, and never did his preaching fail to produce a profound impression. But he was not yet able to remain in Neuchatel. It would be

impossible for us to follow him in all his journeyings hither and thither, in the excursions which he undertook, now to the valley of the Münster, and again to the Vully, and elsewhere. Suffice it to say that while thus engaged he repeatedly returned to Neuchatel, and at length in the year 1530 succeeded in establishing the Reformation there. He had at first preached in the streets, but now the doors of the churches were gradually opened to him. He was first admitted to the hospital chapel, a circumstance which seemed to him to be significant. As Christ must needs be born in a stable, so, he said to himself, the gospel must take for its starting-point, at Neuchatel, the house of the infirm and sick. This thought furnished him with the theme for his first sermon. He did not, however, confine himself to words. He immediately proceeded to action, and without long delay purged the church of its images. This act excited great commotion. The Bernese Government itself, in a letter to Farel, expressed its disapproval of his too hasty procedure, and admonished him not to overstep the bounds prescribed him by the office of evangelist. But who, by a word, can extinguish a conflagration when it is once under way? Excesses were committed in the vicinity of Neuchatel. On the festival of the Assumption of the Virgin, Farel visited a village in the Val-de-Ruz in company with a young Frenchman from Dauphiny. They entered the village church. Mass was read, and the congregation devoutly followed the motions of the celebrant with their eyes, while Farel stood in readiness to preach. This excited the indignation of the young companion of the evangelist. He suddenly sprang towards the priest, snatched the host from his hands, and then turned to the people, crying: "This is not the God whom ye should worship; He is in heaven above, in the majesty of the Father, and not in the hands of the priest." The congregation were silent from consternation. Farel seized the opportunity to speak. But the priest and his adherents flew to the bells and sounded an alarm. The people poured into the church from all quarters, and it was

with difficulty that Farel and his attendant could escape that abusive treatment which they had invited by their more than imprudent conduct. They, however, did not escape entirely unharmed. As they were returning, evening having set in, they were attacked and beaten, in the vicinity of the castle of Valangin, by a throng of men and women armed with clubs. Priests also were amongst their assailants. Farel and his companion were conducted to the castle. As they were passing a chapel on their way thither, the multitude tried to compel them to prostrate themselves before an image of the Virgin, and implore her mercy. When they refused to do this, and Farel again proclaimed the sin of idolatry and pointed to God as man's only helper in time of need, his head was dashed against a wall with such violence that the blood gushed forth, leaving stains that are said to have been visible for years afterwards. Both Farel and his attendant were committed to prison. As soon as the people of Neuchatel heard of these occurrences, they demanded the liberation of the prisoners. The lords of Bern likewise required satisfaction at the hands of the Countess of Valangin for the wrongs which their preachers had suffered within her territory. An investigation was instituted, but no one was punished. The above is an instance in which religious zeal degenerated into blind passion on the one hand, and the savage brutality of the rabble on the other.

By the end of October the conflict was to be decided in the city of Neuchatel. On the 22d of that month iconoclasm was inaugurated, and a number of images were mutilated. The next day (Sunday) Farel preached in the hospital church, which had long been too small to contain all the people who thronged to hear his sermons. On a sudden the preacher expressed his desire to repair to the principal church of the city, and there, without further delay, substitute the word of God for the mass. This proposal struck a responsive chord in the hearts of Farel's auditors. "To the church! to the church!" they shouted with one voice. Farel was at once

hurried away by the crowd, and preacher and people quickly ascended the hill on which both the castle of Neuchatel and the church of Our Lady were situated. The canons in vain strove to hold the sanctuary against the intruders. The doors of the church were burst open, and the multitude pressed in. Farel advanced to the pulpit. This also the clergy attempted to defend, but were as before overpowered by the burghers. And then in the church of the Virgin, within which for four centuries Rome had reigned supreme,[1] there was heard at last, from the mouth of an Evangelical preacher, the simple apostolic declaration of the gospel doctrine of salvation. An ancient chronicle states that the sermon delivered on this occasion was one of the most powerful ever preached by Farel. At the close of his discourse the voice of the assembled throng replied, "We are ready to follow the Evangelical doctrine; both we and our children are resolved to die therein." This was certainly an impressive moment. But a less edifying scene followed it, as a tempest sometimes succeeds the dawn. "Away with the images! away with them this instant!" was the cry that resounded from the impetuous mass. And then began the work of destruction. Thirty chapels in the neighbourhood of the church were torn down—not an altar was left standing. The images were dashed to pieces, and the fragments thrown from the top of the rock, to find a grave beneath the waters of the Seyon. The wafers were taken from their receptacles and eaten like common bread. In vain did the governor, to whom the indignant canons and canonesses had appealed in their distress, endeavour to restore tranquillity. In matters of faith, the burghers declared, he had no right to command. Nor did the Catholic party gain anything by the governor's report, in which he remarked that the whole movement had originated with some hot-headed young men lately returned from the war, and stated further that the majority of the burghers were attached to the ancient faith. It was

[1] [The church was built by Count Ulric II. four centuries before. See D'Aubigné, vol. iv. p. 296.—Tr.]

resolved that the ballot should decide whether such was the case. This resolution taken, the adherents of Reform demanded that the Bernese should be represented by deputies on the occasion. Commissioners from Bern accordingly appeared on the 4th of November. After some lengthy and painful discussions the votes were taken, and the majority, by an excess of but eighteen, however, was found to be on the side of the supporters of the Reformation. The lords of Bern then admonished one and all to preserve the peace. The abolition of the mass was confirmed; it was ordered, however, that the clergy should not be molested, and that the regular tithes and imposts should be duly paid as before.

Farel continued his labours as a travelling preacher. People from Avenches and Payerne would visit Murten, where he was for a time, from curiosity, that they might hear the preacher who excited such a sensation: they went to scoff, thinking themselves proof against every attack that could be made upon their ancient doctrines and customs; but many were captivated by the preacher's words, and returned pricked to the heart and filled with other thoughts than those which had occupied them when they set out. Farel next preached at Avenches. He there met with opposition from the monks and the Bishop of Lausanne, but was again protected by the mighty arm of Bern. The commissioners of that canton, under whose escort he had entered Avenches, requested him to accompany them to Orbe and preach there also. A year previous to this time, he had opposed an indulgence preacher at the latter place, on which occasion the first fountain-basin that he met with served him in the stead of a pulpit; stormy were the scenes that then attended his proclamation of the gospel. The same spirit of resistance was now manifested when, at the close of vespers, he ascended the pulpit in the church at Orbe. His words were received with hisses and whistling, with howls and the stamping of feet, and every term of opprobrium in

the French vocabulary was showered upon him.[1] Farel did not lose his composure, however. The darts of his opposers glanced aside from him. His coolness increased the fury of the raging multitude. The tumult continued. It was impossible for the preacher to finish his discourse. The Bernese bailiff found it necessary to take Farel under his protection, and escort him, arm in arm, to his own house.

A number of similar scenes occurred which it is needless for us to describe. At Orbe, as elsewhere, it was the authoritative command of Bern that finally subdued the insubordinate. Shall we, however, in our disapprobation of the violent measures resorted to, refuse to recognise the hand of Providence in events which, to an observant eye, discover traces of divine governance, even though the wrong-doing of both the parties concerned in them may readily mislead the judgment of the student of history? From this very town of Orbe, which had become the theatre of distressing conflicts, there went forth a man whom God had chosen to be His instrument in the further spread of the Reformation in Romanic Switzerland.

Despite all the opposition of the multitude, there had gradually gathered about Farel at Orbe a faithful little band of hearers. One of those who sat at the feet of Farel was a young man who had been impressed by the gospel at Paris. This youth, whose name was Peter Viret,[2] was born at Orbe in 1511. He was the son of a cloth-shearer, and was the possessor of sound learning and pleasing manners; nor was he deficient in the gift of eloquence. At the solicitation of Farel, he ventured for the first time to preach in his native town on the 6th of May 1531. He then, in company with Farel, preached the gospel at Grandson, and afterwards at Lausanne. If Farel may, from his predominant agency, be termed the Reformer of Neuchatel, Viret may justly be entitled the Reformer of Lausanne. But let us, in the first place, follow him, together with Farel, to Geneva.

[1] They called him *chien, mâtin, hérétique, diable*, etc.

[2] C. Schmidt, *Wilhelm Farel und Peter Viret*, Elberfeld, 1810.

This ancient city of the Allobroges,[1] situated at the mouth of the Rhone, and at the very gates of Italy and France, whose destiny it was to become the third metropolis of the Reformation (after Wittenberg and Zurich), with its venerable cathedral of St. Peter, said to have been built in the days of Clovis, was just at this time in a political ferment. There, as elsewhere, the bishops conjoined secular power with their spiritual authority. But they were not without powerful rivals, among whom were the Counts of Geneva, who dwelt in their strongholds in the vicinity of the city. For assistance against these, the bishop had had recourse to the dukes of the neighbouring territory of Savoy, who, as the lords-protectors (*vidames*) of the city, held the castle on the Isle of the Rhone, and appointed bishops from their own house.[2] In the year 1477, Geneva, for security against the encroachments both of the spiritual and the ducal power, concluded a burgh pact with Bern and Freiburg. In the sixteenth century two hostile parties were drawn up against each other, one of which, the Mamelukes, adhered to the duke, while the other, the Confederates (*Eitgenots*),[3] were attached to Bern and Freiburg. Among the latter were the "Children of

[1] SPON, *Histoire de Genève*, 4 vols., Geneva, 1730; GABEREL, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Genève*, 2 vols., 1858. Contemporaneous accounts: A. FROMENT, *Actes et gestes merveilleux de la cité de Genève* (ed. Revilliod, 1854). From the opposite (Catholic) point of view: JEANNE DE JUSSIEU (a nun), *Le levain du Calvinisme au commencement de l'hérésie de Genève*. Also biographies of Calvin, to be mentioned hereafter. See also MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, *Geschichte der Reformation in Europa zu den Zeiten Calvins*, Elberfeld, 1863 (Book i.); VUILLEMIN, *l.c.*; and KAMPSCHULTE, in his *Biography of Calvin*, vol. i. pp. 1 sqq.

[2] Among these bishops there were some worthless men; such, for instance, as Jean Louis, who was raised by Pius II. to the episcopal see when but twelve years old, and who disgraced the office by vicious conduct. No higher was the standard of morality of Francis of Savoy, who was made bishop in 1482. Antoine Champion (1491), on the other hand, deserves to be numbered among the better class of bishops, among those who earnestly strove after a reformation of the Church. Like Christopher von Utenheim, Bishop of Basel, this Genevan bishop held a reformatory synod in 1493, at which salutary resolutions in reference to church discipline were adopted. See GABEREL, i. pp. 56 sqq. In the book just cited may also be found a number of instances illustrative of the dissoluteness of the clergy, especially those in regular orders.

[3] We shall discuss hereafter the question whether the word Huguenots comes from this, or has some other origin.

Geneva,"[1] the flower of that portion of the youth of the city who aspired after political independence. At the head of this body stood Philip Berthelier, whose opposition to the duke was punished by the loss of his head in May 1519. This event was followed by a reaction, which, however, was of short duration. Berthelier was succeeded by Besançon Hugues. Under his influence, the alliance with Bern and Freiburg, which the duke had endeavoured to rupture, was formally renewed, and the Swiss faction triumphed in 1526. The dominion of the Mamelukes was at an end. Duke Charles III. was obliged to leave the city, and a republican constitution was adopted. The authority of the bishop was also threatened. Not long before the time of which we speak, Bishop John [of Savoy] had been succeeded by Peter de la Baume, of the ancient Burgundian family of the Counts of Montrevel. He was a good-natured man and not destitute of cultivation, but was a great lover of magnificence and luxury, and was addicted to the pleasures of the table and the free use of good wines. Though there may be no proof that he was guilty of those grosser transgressions against morality of which report accused him, and which are recounted in some histories,[2] he was nevertheless, by reason of his moral laxity and utter want of character, unable to cope with the storms of the times, which burst upon him as upon others. Casting himself first upon one party and again upon the other, he became the plaything of both, and at last fell a sacrifice to his own weakness.

Among the reformatory characters of Geneva, one man is mentioned who has been classed among the forerunners of the Reformation, in the stricter sense of the term, and whose religious and ecclesiastical value was for a long time over-estimated — we refer to Francis Bonivard, prior of St. Victor's. Far too much honour is done him by those

[1] This was at first the general title of the young men of Geneva who were capable of bearing arms; it soon, however, became a party name.

[2] See KAMPSCHULTE, *l.c.* p. 56.

who call him the Erasmus of Geneva. It is true, he was a man of acuteness and wit, but he possessed no moral depth or earnestness of character; a Schoolman and satirist, he was led by caprice rather than principle. His imprisonment for several years (1530–36) in the castle of Chillon, at the east extremity of the Lake of Geneva, has been much lauded as that of a martyr for political and religious liberty, and has been celebrated in verse by poets such as Byron. Bonivard's occasional attacks upon Rome and the abuses of the Church proceeded altogether, however, from another than the evangelical spirit of reform; so that, from the standpoint of a history of the Reformation, we can accord him but a passing notice, and have now to turn again to those men whom we may truly regard as the Reformers of Geneva.[1] Among these we must first mention Farel. Our previous designation of him as in a special sense the Reformer of Neuchatel, need not prevent us from applying the same term to him with reference to Geneva. He prepared the way for the man who was in the fullest sense the Reformer of that city.

Farel repaired to Geneva in October 1535, in company with his friend Antony Saunier, with whom he had previously visited the Waldensian valleys of Piedmont.[2]

[1] In regard to Bonivard, we refer the reader to GALIFFE's article (from unprinted manuscripts) in Herzog's *Realenc.* xix. pp. 240 sqq. Bonivard's *Advis et dévis à l'état ecclésiastique et à ses mutations* certainly contains some strong passages adverse to Rome. But the frivolous and superficial estimate which the prisoner of Chillon entertained concerning the German Reformation is instanced by Merle D'Aubigné as follows:—"Leo X. and his predecessors always regarded the Germans as *pecora campi*, and they were right in so thinking of them, for they in their simplicity suffered themselves to be ridden and bridled like asses. The popes threatened them with cudgels (excommunication), soothed them with thistles (indulgences), and made them trot to mill to fetch them meal. One day, however, when Leo had imposed too heavy a load upon his donkey, the beast let fly his heels to such effect that the flour was spilled and the bread lost. This donkey, like all donkeys, was called Martin, and his surname was Luther, which means enlightener."

[2] Farel's sojourn in Geneva is thus described by the nun Jeanne de Jussieu:—"In the following month of October there came to Geneva a sorry wretch of a preacher named Master William, a native of Gap in Dauphiny. The day after his arrival, he commenced preaching privately at his lodgings, in presence of a great number of people, who had been informed of his coming and were already infected with his heresy."

He held meetings in a private house. Soon he was summoned before the council. The charge of inciting the people to revolution he calmly denied, stating that he preached nothing but divine truth, for which he was ready to die. He likewise referred to the testimonials of their excellencies of Bern, which he carried with him. This put a new aspect upon the matter. The councillors dismissed Farel and his companion in the most friendly manner, though they did not omit to caution them against disturbing the public tranquillity. They had scarcely returned from the council hall, however, when they were cited to appear before the episcopal grand-vicar, Amadée de Guigins, abbot of Bonmont. They were escorted by a deputation sent to them by the canons. On their way to the grand-vicar the populace reviled them, and women especially distinguished themselves in hurling opprobrious epithets at them.[1] From the priests they received a very unpriest-like greeting: "Come hither," cried they, "you abominable devil of a Farel! What business have you to be going about and turning things topsy-turvy? Who told you to come to this city? Under whose authority do you preach?" They demanded that he should prove his commission by working miracles, as Moses had done. Farel replied: "I am not a devil; I preach Jesus Christ, the crucified, who died for our sins and rose again for our justification. . . . I have come to this city to see whether there are not some here who will listen to me quietly, and I am ready to confirm what I say by my death. I derive my authority from none other than God. I am no disturber of the peace, and therefore I can give you no other answer than that which Elijah gave to Ahab: 'It is not *I* that trouble Israel; it is *thou*. Ye have troubled the whole world with your traditions and human ordinances.'"

"He has blasphemed God!" exclaimed one of the most distinguished men in the assembly, rising from his seat; "what need have we of further testimony? He is worthy of

[1] *Ces sont des caignes* (*chiens*) *qui passent*, the people cried out.

death. Into the Rhone with him! into the Rhone! He must die. It is better that this abominable Lutheran should die than that he should trouble the people." Farel answered, "Speak the words of God, and not those of Caiaphas." But louder grew the cry, "Kill him, kill this Lutheran, this dog!" Finally they dismissed him. As he was leaving the hall a bullet was fired at him, but the gun from which it was discharged burst in the hands of his assailant. Some one else rushed at him with a naked sword. One of the syndics in attendance at last succeeded in rescuing him from the hands of the raging mob. Even as he was returning to his lodgings, he was followed by the cry, "Into the Rhone with him!" The next morning his friends put him on board a boat which landed him between Morges and Lausanne. Thence Farel proceeded to Orbe and Grandson, where he greeted his brethren in the faith. In the neighbourhood of Grandson he met with a young man from the south of France, who was at that time pastor of Yvonand, a village on the southern shore of the Lake of Neuchatel. This person, whose name was Antoiny Froment, he endeavoured to secure as a preacher for Geneva. After some little hesitation, Froment resolved to repair to the city in question, relying on God. On the 3d of November he arrived at his destination, where he was an utter stranger. There being no one to whom he could apply for countenance, on his own responsibility he opened a school for the instruction of children in reading and writing. What the little ones heard in school about divine things they related at their homes. In consequence thereof, the fathers and mothers themselves repaired to the school, and school hours were turned into Bible hours. The number of Froment's hearers increased from day to day. The schoolroom in the inn "of the Golden Cross" was no longer large enough to accommodate them, nor did the porch suffice for the reception of the excess. "To the Molard!" (the public square) was the cry that went up from the crowd that waited without the house. Froment was hurried away by the people, who meanwhile besought him to preach the

word of God to them. Mounted on a fish bench, he discoursed on the text, "Beware of false prophets," etc. The council sent a messenger to him commanding him to descend from his improvised platform. Froment, however, was ready with the answer, "We ought to obey God rather than man." Then turning again to the people, he said, "Do not be disturbed, my friends, but listen to the description which Christ our Lord gives of false prophets." He then portrayed the priesthood to the life, sketching its characteristics with vigorous touches and occasionally, it must be confessed, some exaggeration. How could the attacked party endure such an assault? The priests armed themselves and rushed upon him, with the governor at their head. To avoid bloodshed, Froment was finally persuaded to descend. He soon afterwards left the city. This scene was followed by an edict of the Government forbidding all public preaching, on pain of being whipped out of the city.

In the meantime the efforts of Froment had resulted in the gathering of a little band of believers, who resolved to continue their meetings for the study of God's word even in the absence of a preacher. They assembled by night in a private house, and celebrated the Lord's Supper in a garden. A capmaker (or, according to others, a stocking-weaver), named Guérin Muète, was the leader of the conventicle. He too, however, was obliged to leave the city.

In connection with Farel and Froment, we must mention the name of Peter Robert Olivetanus, a native of Nojou, in Picardy. He was a kinsman of Calvin. He also spent some time at Geneva as tutor in a wealthy family. His special share in the Reformation of Romanic Switzerland, and Geneva in particular, was as a translator of the Bible.

The lords of Bern regarded Farel's expulsion from Geneva as an insult to themselves, for they had recommended the man. They upbraided the Genevans for their conduct in the matter, and charged them no longer to hinder the free proclamation of the gospel. On the reading of the Bernese

epistle, a tumult arose in the council. The priests meantime had assembled at St. Peter's. Two hundred of their adherents marched into the council hall and entered a complaint against the people who had come to introduce a new religion. Whilst the council (three days afterwards) were deliberating upon the answer that should be despatched to Bern, there arose a tumult in the streets that excited the gravest apprehensions. Armed adherents of the priests' party drew up before the house in which the Protestants held their meetings. This house, which was in the Rue basse des Allemands, was the residence of a man named Baudichon.[1] The populace pressed towards the Molard. Peter Vandel, on lifting up his voice in favour of peace, received a wound from a dagger. All the citizens flew to arms. The bells sounded an alarm. The priests marched in procession through the streets with crucifix and banners, singing as they went the *Vexilla regis prodeunt.* The people—men, women, and children—followed the priestly train, crying, "Down with the Lutherans!" The latter, whose number amounted to about sixty, though wholly unprotected, were resolved not to swerve a hair's-breadth from their convictions; they comforted themselves in this emergency with the words of the apostle, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Through the mediation of some Freiburgers, who pressed in between the combatants, the storm was checked for a brief period; it, however, burst forth again with fresh fury. In another street battle a canon named Peter Vernli (Vehrly), a native of Freiburg, in trying to clear a passage for himself and his attendants, was mortally wounded and sank lifeless to the ground. By the priestly party his death was regarded in the light of a martyrdom. The canon was buried with great pomp. The fact that the corpse of the dead man retained a fresh and ruddy appearance till the fifth day after his decease

[1] The moral character of this man was certainly not above reproach. See KAMPSCHULTE, p. 76. He was undoubtedly an eccentric individual; but whether he made a purely revolutionary use of the religious ideas of the Reformation, as Kampschulte (p. 98) accuses him of having done, may be left for others to decide.

was looked upon as a miracle; and it is further stated that an agreeable odour, such as has been observed to attend only upon saints, was diffused about the body. Bloody vengeance was sworn against the man who slew this saint. Commissioners from Freiburg made their appearance at Geneva and demanded satisfaction for the canon's death. A poor carman accordingly, after having been intoxicated by the priestly party, was stretched upon the rack, and a confession having thus been extorted from him, he was executed.

Bern also interposed. An edict was finally issued providing that every person should be at liberty to make choice either of the mass or of the preaching of the gospel. On the 5th of July 1533, the bishop left the city. Froment returned to Geneva in company with a certain man named Dumoulin. The priestly party, however, now put forth their champion also. To stop the mouths of the "chimney-corner preachers," a famous doctor of the Sorbonne, Guy Furbity by name, was appointed to preach at Geneva during the season of Advent. He was escorted to St. Peter's Cathedral by a guard of soldiers. With a great deal of self-confidence he challenged his antagonists from the pulpit. "Where," he demanded, "are these fine preachers? Why do they show themselves only in places where they can impose upon ignorant persons and feeble women?" At this Froment stepped forth. Waving his hand, he requested that he might be allowed to speak. A solemn silence ensued. The eyes of all were fastened upon Froment, who then testified concerning that faith which is already familiar to us. The doctor of the Sorbonne was dumb. In vain the multitude importuned him to reply. The priests again had recourse to the sword, and once more resounded the cry, "Away with him into the Rhone!" As Froment left the church, the furious company of priests, with their adherents, followed him. Baudichon was obliged to defend him with the drawn sword against ill-usage. Dumoulin, on attempting to speak to the multitude, was arrested and conducted before the council. Sentence of death was nearly pronounced upon

him as a disturber of the peace, but the council finally contented themselves with decreeing his banishment from the city. A great multitude accompanied him beyond the gate of St. Gervais. When the precincts of the city had been passed, a halt was made, and Dumoulin preached to the people for two hours. From Geneva he went to Lyons, where he suffered the martyrdom which he had escaped in the former city.

Froment and Baudichon proceeded to Bern and related all that had befallen them. The lords of Bern took a very serious view of the matter. They provided Baudichon, who was joined by Farel, with letters to the Council of Geneva. The Bernese demanded that free course should be allowed to the gospel. Not so the authorities of Freiburg, who were prepared to renounce their alliance with Bern and Geneva if the latter complied with the requisitions of Bern. After a number of disturbances which we are unable to examine into, it was at last resolved to submit the controverted question to a public disputation, the issue of which should finally decide the ecclesiastical destinies of the republic.

This disputation was held on the 29th of January 1534. The authority of the Church and the Scriptures, and the practice of fasting, formed the subjects of debate. When Furbity appealed to the authority of Saint Thomas Aquinas in justification of fasting, the lords of Bern objected, being willing to receive no testimony save that of Holy Writ. Thus at the outset the Reformatory principle was recognised to be the true one, and Furbity was forced to withdraw from the field. He was ordered to make a public recantation of his doctrine from the pulpit. This was a hard requirement. A large crowd assembled in the cathedral to witness the recantation, but the poor man could not bring himself to comply with the harsh command. Something he stammered, indistinctly enough, and the impatient people dragged him from the pulpit.[1] The Bernese who were present found it

[1] The whole of the proceedings against Furbity are set forth in a light more favourable to him by KAMPSCHULTE, pp. 141 sqq.

necessary to protect him from the violence of an excited crowd, as they had previously defended the Reformers. Furbity was imprisoned for a while, and the claims of justice seemed thus to be satisfied. The Bernese next demanded that a temple should be consecrated to the worship of the Reformed. The Government of Geneva delaying to accede to this requisition, a number of those who held the Reformed faith called upon Farel on the 1st of March 1534, and escorted him to the hall of the Franciscan cloister of Rive, where he delivered a sermon. From that time this cloister church remained in the possession of the Reformed. Farel preached there daily during the Lenten season. He wore no robes, but preached in ordinary citizen's dress, such as was customary at that time. This was the general practice of Reformers in the Reformed Church.

The first disputation had not decided all disputed points, and a second one was found to be requisite. This lasted four entire weeks, from 30th May to 24th June. In June of the same year [1534], Farel and Viret began to celebrate the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Reformed Church, acting as usual under the protection of Bern. Freiburg, indignant at the introduction of so many innovations, had already, in pursuance of its threat, withdrawn from its alliance with Geneva. In July the banished bishop, assisted by the Catholic cantons of the Confederacy, which he extolled as the "defenders of his poor Church," and aided especially by Freiburg, made an unsuccessful attempt to surprise the city of Geneva and capture it by force of arms. Upon the failure of this plan, Geneva fully and formally renounced allegiance to the bishop, who by his undertaking had acted the part of a rebel against the civil authority. Thenceforth but little resistance was offered by the adherents of the old order of things. As Farel was going one day, as usual, to the Franciscan cloister of Rive, for the purpose of preaching, his friends conducted him in triumph to the church of St. Madeleine, that God's word might there also be fearlessly proclaimed.

It was the feast of the church's consecration, and the priest was about to read mass. He attempted to make his escape, but was compelled to remain and hear Farel's sermon. Soon afterwards the Reformed took possession of St. Gervais, and a few days later Farel preached in the principal church of the city, St. Peter's Cathedral, from which a tumultuous crowd, led on by the hot-blooded Baudichon, removed the images and relics.

On the 10th of August, Farel appeared before the Grand Council, and in an impressive discourse once more set before them the indefensibility of images and the mass. He concluded his address with a fervent prayer that God would enlighten the lords of the council, to the salvation of the entire people of Geneva. The council were still unwilling to do anything rashly, and were also desirous of hearing the adverse party. They accordingly invited the monks to appear before them on the 12th of August, and asked them what they had to say in favour of the mass. The monks, however, who were for the most part aged men, destitute of theological culture, found nothing to reply. They candidly confessed their lack of learning, and stated that they had followed the ordinances of their fathers without personal investigation. They further begged that they might be permitted to continue unmolested in the practice of their religious exercises. The secular clergy, to whom the same question was proposed as to the monks, more defiantly expressed their purpose to abide by the Catholic faith. The council, very naturally, would not accede to this determination. Finally, on the 27th of August 1535, an edict was published, abolishing the Romish rites and legalizing the preaching of the gospel at Geneva. Those of the clergy who adhered to the ancient faith, and also the monks and nuns, quitted the city.[1]

The Duke of Savoy now tried the effect of clemency, with the hope of reingratiating himself with the Genevans. He

[1] On the dignified behaviour of the Sisters of St. Clara on this occasion, see KAMPSCHULTE, *l.c.* p. 173.

offered the city peace and free passage through his domains on condition of renouncing heresy. But the Genevans replied that the gospel was dearer to them than all temporal prosperity, and they would rather surrender their city to the flames than be deprived of that pearl of great price.[1]

In comparing the passionate struggles of French-speaking Switzerland with the progress of the Reformation among the German population of the Confederacy—a progress proportionally quiet in the main, or at least interrupted only by passing storms; and, again, in contrasting the ofttimes violent method of Farel with the prudent yet persevering course of Zwingle and Œcolampadius, it is necessary always to take into consideration the difference between the Germanic and the Romanic blood, as well as the diversity of personal character. In the end, however, it will be manifest, here as elsewhere, that howsoever man may sin, God's ways are always equal, and in the case either of nations or individuals, surely lead on to the goal which eternal Wisdom has determined. What Geneva became in consequence of the Reformation, we shall see in connection with the history of that man whose name is, more closely than any other, bound up with the history of the city. For the present we must return to the German Reformation, the course of which we have anticipated by about two years.

[1] In 1523 Luther based the most ardent hopes on this Duke Charles of Savoy as a friend and supporter of the gospel. See his letter of 7th September, given in German by De Wette, ii. No. 528, in Latin, vi. No. 2354.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE PROSPECTIVE COUNCIL—RESTORATION OF THE DUKEDOM OF WURTEMBERG BY THE PEACE OF CADAN—THE REFORMATION IN WURTEMBERG AND ITS EFFECTS UPON SOUTHERN GERMANY — AUGSBURG, FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN — POMERANIA — WESTPHALIA — SOEST, PADERBORN, MÜNSTER —THE ANABAPTISTS AND THEIR KINGDOM.

WE shall now return to the general history of the Reformation, devoting our attention, in the first place, once more to Germany. At the beginning of the year 1533, the emperor, while in Italy, had held a conference with the pope at Bologna. It was then resolved that measures should be taken to realize the long-talked-of council. Accordingly, the imperial envoy, Lampert de Briarde, and the Papal legate, Hugo Rango, bishop of Reggio, repaired to Germany for the purpose of notifying the German princes that the pope intended to convene a general assembly of the Church after the ancient fashion. Where this assembly was to meet was not yet decided, Mantua, Bologna, and Piacenza all being spoken of as probable localities. The Protestants were invited to attend this council, and were further requested to suspend all innovations in religious matters until the council should have taken place. The new Elector of Saxony, John Frederick the Magnanimous, received the joint embassy of the emperor and the pope at Weimar, having previously obtained the written opinion of his theologians concerning the subject to be discussed.[1] That opinion was by no means

[1] Four opinions jointly drawn up by Luther, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, and Jonas, DE WETTE, iv. No. 1523.

favourable to the Papal proposal. If the pope had been about to convoke a council in accordance with the word of God, the Protestants would have been in duty bound to attend that council; but a council "after the ancient fashion" could by no possibility be a true and free council. "The very first article," the theologians declared, is "knavishly and treacherously worded; it shuns the light and mutters in the dark, like a half angel, half devil." Nor, it was further represented, did the questions to be discussed relate "simply to controversies in Germany," as the pope pretended; the cause was one that concerned all Christendom, seeing that it had to do with the word of God. Still the theologians thought it not advisable that an opposition council should be held, and recommended that the matter should be conducted with all the gentleness possible without a denial of the truth. The elector's reply embodied the opinion of his theologians, with a more courteous wording, of course. But before the council could take place, events occurred that gave rise to fresh embarrassments. Among these occurrences was the military expedition undertaken by Philip of Hesse in behalf of his kinsman Duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg. The latter had, in the year 1519, been driven from his dominions by the Swabian Alliance, for taking the city of Reutlingen by surprise; and in 1531 his dukedom was sold to the emperor, who had bestowed it upon his brother Ferdinand. After the dissolution of the alliance (in 1533), and during the absence of the emperor in Spain, the landgrave availed himself of the favourable opportunity thus offered to assist his friend to regain his old possessions. The Elector of Saxony vainly endeavoured to dissuade Philip from so perilous an enterprise. The landgrave went rapidly to work, as was his custom. Obtaining money from Francis I., king of France, he assembled an army and defeated the troops of Ferdinand near Laufen on the Neckar, about a mile from Heilbronn. The duke was reinstated, and "Wurtemberg once more became Wurtembergish," as Ranke says.[1] On the 14th of

[1] *Deutsche Geschichte*, iii. p. 462.

May 1534, the victors entered Stuttgart, and three days afterwards the victory was celebrated by the preaching of two evangelical sermons. In June, Philip concluded a peace with King Ferdinand at Cadan in Bohemia, not forgetting the interests of the Reformation. The religious peace of Nuremberg was ratified on this occasion. Ferdinand was obliged to promise to forbid the imperial chamber to prosecute complaints against the Protestants. The members of the league of Schmalkald now, for the first time, manifested a willingness to recognise Ferdinand as Roman king. Luther congratulated himself on the unlooked-for victory, and expressed his hope that God would finish what He had begun.[1]

By the treaty of peace, Duke Ulrich was forbidden to compel any person in his territories to embrace the doctrines of the Reformation; he was, however, at liberty legally to establish the reform where it had already taken root. He went to work, accordingly, without delay. The task which first presented itself to him was a work of union. Both doctrines concerning the Lord's Supper had obtained adherents in the dukedom. In one part of the country [*ob der Steig*] the Swiss doctrine prevailed, while the remaining part [*unter der Steig*] had adopted the Lutheran view. Ulrich himself had long been in correspondence with the Swiss Reformers, and also with Bucer and Capito of Strassburg. By the latter, Simon Grynæus of Basel and Ambrose Blarer of Constance were recommended to him as men who might aid him in establishing the Reformation.[2] The friends of Lutheranism directed the attention of the duke to Brenz at Schwäbisch-Hall. Had the duke's re-establishment occurred prior to the defeat of the Swiss at Cappel, their doctrine might readily

[1] Letter to Justus Menius, De Wette, iv. No. 1596.

[2] It was said of Blarer: "He is truly such a learned, affable, kind, brave, and discreet man, his whole behaviour is so honest, pious, and gracious; and furthermore, God has endowed him with such a special gift for ordering churches in accordance with true Christianity, that we are sure if your princely grace should yourself listen to his conversation and have any dealings with him, you would confess that all we have said of him is true." See Pressel, *l.c.* p. 97.

have gained the upper hand, as Landgrave Philip was also on the side of the Swiss. At the present juncture, however, their prospects were less favourable. The articles of peace subscribed at Cadan were, moreover, hostile to the Sacramentarians, so that even Landgrave Philip concurred with Duke Ulrich in the determination of the latter to confer ecclesiastical appointments upon such men only as maintained the doctrine of the true presence of Christ's true body and blood in the sacramental bread and wine. The duke, nevertheless, was not averse to an effort to secure an understanding between the two parties. In the castle at Stuttgart, accordingly, a religious discussion took place between Blarer, who established himself at Tubingen, and Erhard Schnepff, then professor at Marburg, but a native of Heilbronn in Swabia. The discussion was at first rather wearisome, as Schnepff evinced much obstinacy.[1] The disputants, however, finally agreed upon a formula which set forth the presence of Christ's body and blood as real and veritable, but at the same time excluded the conception of that presence as material and local. This conclusion, which heartily delighted the duke, was reached on the 2d of August 1534. Ulrich requested of the disputants that neither should boast that the other had recanted, but that each should say that they had come to an agreement. Notwithstanding this precaution, however, the "Concord of Stuttgart" was followed by many a controversy of tongue and pen, further notice of which we omit.[2] The grand result was, that the Reformation at length made progress. Blarer directed its course in one part of the dukedom [*ob der Steig*], while Schnepff was entrusted with the conduct thereof in another portion of the province [*unter der Steig*]. In the following year (1535), Brenz was called to Stuttgart, in order that he might establish the Reformation

[1] The landgrave admonished him to proceed gently and not to "wrangle about words," and Melanchthon also recommended meekness to his friend (*Corp. Ref.* ii. p. 786); HARTMANN, *E. Schnepff*, Tubingen, 1870, p. 37.

[2] For particulars, see PRESSEL, *l.c.*

there in accordance with the Lutheran doctrine.[1] He revised the ecclesiastical constitution already planned by Schnepff, to which were added an order of visitation and regulations concerning matrimony.[2]

The Reformation of Wurtemberg favourably affected the cause of Reform throughout Southern Germany. The Swabian Alliance had done its utmost for the repression of evangelical sentiments; but after the dissolution of that union, people began to breathe more freely. After the death of Margrave Philip of Baden (1535), Protestantism was, under the rule of Margrave Ernest, largely embraced in the northern portion of the margraviate; while the southern part, under the influence of Catholic tutelage, clung to Catholicism.

It was a fact of no slight importance that the city of Augsburg embraced the doctrines of the Reformation. On the 22d of July 1534, the great and little council of that city resolved that no Papist preachers should be allowed, or the mass be longer tolerated, in any churches save those that pertained immediately to the bishop. In consequence of this edict, most of the chapels were closed. A portion of the clergy left the city, while the rest gathered more closely around the bishop and chapter.[3] The latter made good their stand against the Protestants, so that from that time both the Catholic and the Evangelical form of worship subsisted side by side in the city. A similar condition of things prevailed in Frankfort-on-the-Main. We have already seen that the preaching of Hartmann Ibach was very favourably received in that city as early as the year 1522, and from that time forth. The opposite party, however, continued to have its adherents. The parish church was divided between the Catholics and the Protestants. Hateful polemical discourses

[1] The Lord's Supper was for the first time administered in both kinds at Stuttgart during Lent.

[2] See HARTMANN UND JÄGER, vol. ii.; HARTMANN, *Joh. Brenz*, pp. 15 sqq.; RANKE, *l.c.*; GRÜNEISEN, *Denkblatt der Reformation der Stadt Stuttgart*, 1835.

[3] RANKE, iii. p. 487.

were delivered from the pulpits. On the Protestant side, Dionysius Melander distinguished himself by his immoderate zeal. Iconoclasm was resorted to in 1533. The council, importuned for a decision by the guilds, was at length compelled to take energetic measures. The Catholic foundations of the city (St. Bartholomew's, Our Lady's, and St. Leonard's) were commanded to discontinue the rites of the Catholic Church. The burghers were forbidden to attend mass at the neighbouring towns and villages, and a father who had had his child baptized outside the city was fined. The introduction of a complete order for the evangelical celebration of divine worship perfected the reform; but in November 1535 the council found it necessary to sanction the revival of the Catholic ritual of worship, and its continuance together with the Protestant form.[1]

The Reformation made progress in Northern Germany also at about this time. George and Parnim, the two princes of Pomerania, held different views on the subject of religion. Parnim declared that when his brother said "Up!" he would say "Down!"[2] The two thus counterbalanced each other. George dying, however, and his son Philip being more accessible to the Evangelical doctrine than his father had been, a union of the two parties was brought about at Cammin, in August 1534. A plan of reformation was drawn up at the Diet of Treptow and was favourably received. Dr. Pommer (Bugenhagen) was invited to perform an ecclesiastical visitation.

A desire for ecclesiastical reform had long been manifested in Westphalia, but there was also no lack of opposing forces. In the cities of Soest and Paderborn some shocking scenes were enacted.[3] It was only upon compulsion that the burgomaster and council of Soest had given their consent to the preaching of Lutheran doctrines, and they harboured intentions of vengeance against the leaders of the reformatory

[1] See STEITZ, in Herzog's *Realenc.* iv. pp. 457 sqq.
[2] RANKE, *l.c.* [3] RANKE, *l.c.* pp. 492 sqq.

movement. They found an opportunity to vent this secret resentment upon a simple burgher named Schlachtorp, a tanner by occupation. This man had, when heated by wine, railed at the magistracy, and for this offence he was condemned to die as an opposer of law and justice and inciter to sedition. Schlachtorp regarded himself, however, as a martyr in the cause of the Evangelical faith, for the sake of which he declared he had been condemned and was ready to die. He suffered himself to be led forth to death without resistance. At the place of execution he began to sing the hymn commencing, *Mit Fried und Freud fahr ich dahin* ("I seek my heavenly home with joy"), and the multitude, whose hearts he had won, united their voices with his. With alacrity he offered his neck to the sword, but the blow of the executioner, instead of descending on the proper place, fell upon the back of the doomed man. Schlachtorp, severely wounded though he was, started up, and a struggle ensued between himself and his executioner, ending in the seizure of the sword by the half-murdered man. The people, who had witnessed this battle with horror, greeted its issue with acclamations of joy. Schlachtorp, bearing the sword thus won, was conducted in triumph to his house. There, indeed, he died, in consequence of loss of blood and excitement, but his funeral was attended with great pomp. The captured sword of justice was laid upon his coffin. The people's voice had decided. The old council was obliged to succumb; a new one was introduced, and with it the Reformation. These events took place in July 1533.

Paderborn was the scene of similar occurrences, though of none with so bloody an issue as the foregoing. In this city the cession of a few of the churches to Evangelical preachers had not been effected without a popular tumult, negotiation with the secular authorities having proved of no avail. On the occasion of the armed entry of the newly-appointed administrator of the foundation, Bishop and Elector Hermann of Cologne, who was at this time to receive the homage of the

burghers, the latter, at the instigation of the council and the canons, were all assembled in the garden of a certain convent; there they were suddenly surrounded by armed troops, and their leaders were arrested and consigned to prison. The imprisoned men, after being subjected to torture, had sentence of death pronounced upon them, which sentence was to be executed in the presence of the populace. They were accordingly conducted to the place of execution, where a scaffold had been erected and strewn with sand to receive the blood of the condemned. At this juncture, however, the chief executioner declared that he could not overstep the bounds of his office, and that, as the men were innocent, he would rather die himself than take their lives. An aged man, who was among the spectators, also lifted up his voice, saying that he himself was as guilty as were the condemned, and demanding to be executed with them. Matrons and maidens now pressed forward and entreated that the prisoners might be pardoned. This scene brought tears to the eyes of the elector, who was no fanatic,—indeed, he had a secret leaning towards the Evangelicals,[1]—and he gave the condemned their lives. This, however, was not equivalent to a victory for the Reformation. The Evangelicals continued under strict supervision, and by an edict of the 18th of October 1532, the severest penalties were pronounced upon those who should embrace the new doctrine.

The old city of Münster,[2] the name of which recalls the days when the building of a house of God formed the nucleus around which a whole city gathered, was the seat of a bishop, with whom a cathedral chapter of forty members was associated. The individuals who composed this body, though for the most part men of learning, were addicted to the more refined pleasures of the world, and, encased in an armour of aristocratic pride, manifested no appreciation of the earnest movements of

[1] Hereafter we shall see him embrace the Reformation. On the occasion referred to above, he permitted a misuse of his name and authority.

[2] [Minster.]

the time. Reform here pursued its usual course, stirring first the masses, and from them gradually working its way upward. A young chaplain of the foundation of St. Maurice, Bernard Rottmann (Rothmann) by name, a native of Hesse, began to preach the pure gospel here in 1531 (some say 1529), and found many adherents among the burghers. The foundation of St. Maurice was situated outside of the city, but the people, eager to hear the new doctrine, went in crowds to attend upon the discourses of the youthful preacher. At last they wished him to hold forth in the city, and St. Lambert's Church being closed to him, he preached in the churchyard from a block of wood. The concourse of people finally succeeded in bursting open the church doors, when they immediately proceeded to destroy the images. A disputation was at length resorted to, which resulted in the expulsion of the Romish clergy, they having proved unable satisfactorily to defend their doctrines and practices. The bishop, by a voluntary resignation of his office, had opportunely evaded the reformatory movements. He was succeeded by the Bishop of Minden, Count Francis von Waldeck, who, however, found himself, in company with his chapter, compelled to leave the city. He was joined by the adherents of the old Church and also by some members of the council. The Episcopal party enlisted the aid of three hundred lanzknechts. The neighbouring village of Telgte, on the Ems, where the bishop had a country seat, became the rallying-place of the Catholics. Thence, on Christmas day 1532, a proclamation was issued commanding the people of Münster to dismiss their Evangelical preachers, and threatening punishment in case of non-compliance with this order. But the people were resolved upon resistance, and even anticipated the bishop's execution of his threats. An attack on Telgte was immediately decided upon and forthwith set on foot. Six hundred armed burghers, accompanied by three hundred mercenaries, fell upon the episcopal castle by night, and captured the canons, the princely councillors, and those members of the council of Münster who had taken refuge with the

bishop—all of whom they carried to the city in three waggons on St. Stephen's day. The bishop had fled previous to the attack. In February 1533, through the mediation of the Landgrave of Hesse, a peace was brought about, which provided that all the parish churches of the city should be given up to the Evangelicals. The cathedral alone, with its chapter, remained Catholic.

A little before Christmas, on St. Thomas' day (21st December 1532), Luther wrote to the council at Münster congratulating them on the victory of the gospel, but also (as if he had a presentiment of what was about to happen) admonishing the people of Münster not to suffer themselves to be led astray by the heresies of the Anabaptists or other sectarians. It is true that he counted Zwingle as one of these same heretics, placing him on a par with Münzer, Hetzer, Hubmaier, and other kindred spirits.[1] He praises Bernard Rottmann as a "fine preacher," but then, as though he had not entire confidence in him, goes on to say: "Nevertheless, it is needful to admonish and warn him and all other preachers to watch and pray diligently that they and their people may be preserved from such false teachers. The devil is a sly rogue and able to seduce fine, pious, and learned preachers; we have, alas! before our eyes the example of many who have fallen away from the pure word and have become followers of Zwingle, Münzer, or the Anabaptists; such have also become disturbers of the public peace, and once and again have laid hands on the reins of secular government, as was the case with Zwingle himself."

Luther even addressed a similar letter to Rottmann.[2] He had heard, he wrote, that Sacramentarians had crept into Westphalia, and he begged the preacher to be on his guard against them, both for his own sake and for the sake of his congregation.

As for Rottmann, he seemed at first determined to take a decided stand against the Anabaptists, who were undoubtedly

[1] De Wette, iv. No. 1496. [2] Ibid. No. 1497.

active in those regions.[1] As early as September 1532 (before he received Luther's warning), he wrote thus to a friend: "I have already had much to do with the Anabaptists; for the time being, they have desisted from more active operations, but threaten to return to the charge with renewed vigour. However, if God be for us, who can be against us?" He was an avowed adherent of the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper, nor do his sentiments on this subject appear to have been changed by Luther's epistle. In a letter written about Whitsuntide 1533, he complains bitterly, "I cannot adequately describe how the Lutherans threaten us." Too soon, however, he showed himself a fanatic by rudely attempting an ocular demonstration of Christ's non-presence in the bread of the Eucharist. He took a wafer and threw it on the ground, saying to the bystanders, "Look you, where is the flesh and blood in that? If that were a God, He would pick Himself up and return to the altar." He next proceeded to celebrate the Lord's Supper in its primitive form. He crumbled bread into a dish, poured wine over it, and invited his companions at table to draw near and partake thereof, he having first spoken the words of institution. At the same time he developed into an Anabaptist. He called infant baptism an abomination in the sight of God, and refused to baptize infants. The pulpit was now forbidden him. In common with the preachers who espoused his cause, he issued a Confession, in which he expressed his adherence to the Zwinglian doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, and his rejection of infant baptism. Thus did he, like Luther, yet in a different sense, associate Zwingle and Münzer. History owes him the statement, however, that from this time forth

[1] After being driven from Germany and Switzerland, they scattered in all directions. We meet with them in Salzburg and its vicinity under the name of the "Gardener Brethren." There also they were persecuted. In the year 1527, they and their meeting-house were burned together. A young girl whom the persecuting party were unwilling to cast alive into the flames, was carried in the arms of the executioner to the horse-pond, plunged beneath the water, and drowned, her corpse being afterwards burned (HASE, *Neue Propheten*, p. 177). Some fled to the Netherlands and some gathered in Westphalia.

he lived a life of strict self-denial, withdrew from all social pleasures, and earned the reputation of a rigid ascetic.

The Anabaptists now made common cause with the preacher who had once so valiantly opposed them. The Council of Münster were thus thrown into no little perplexity. At first they proposed closing all the churches in the city. Becoming convinced, however, of the inexpediency of this measure, they had a preacher sent them by the landgrave, one Fabricius by name. This man was expected to preside over the Evangelical Church party and silence the Anabaptists, against whom the churches continued to be closed. The last he did not succeed in accomplishing. Rottmann preached in private houses, and at times, in spite of the mandate, forced his way into a church. His adherents made themselves heard in the market-places and the churchyards. A journeyman smith who thus preached was imprisoned, but speedily restored to liberty upon the menaces of his guild-fellows. Converts who had not yet been rebaptized, among whom was Rottmann himself, were baptized afresh by deputies from the Netherlands. On the 14th of January 1534, two apostles of the sect made their appearance in Münster. These were John Bockhold (Bockelsohn, Benkelszoon), a tailor of Leyden, and John Matthias (Matthiesen, Matthyszoon), a baker of Haarlem, the latter of whom declared himself to be Enoch. Under the influence of these demagogues, fanaticism reached a dangerous height. They found a confederate in Berendt Knipperdolling, a cloth dealer: originally of Münster, he had some time before been banished from the city, had made the acquaintance of the new prophets during his wanderings, and now cast in his lot with them, with the intention of establishing a new Jerusalem. These men usurped the civil authority. Knipperdolling became first burgomaster, and another fanatic obtained the position of second burgomaster. A reign of terror now ensued, in which the wildest fanaticism displayed at once its most appalling and most ludicrous forms. A

community of goods was immediately proclaimed. All in Münster who possessed silver, gold, jewels, or works of art, were commanded, on pain of death, to deliver them up at the City Hall. Pictures and musical instruments were ruthlessly destroyed. Every man was ordered to work for the community, and common meals were instituted, as in Sparta, for the purpose of uniting all into one family.

People of wealth who were able to leave the city at this time, took their departure, and those who did not voluntarily go were forcibly expelled. Anabaptism, though only in the limited area of a city government, succeeded in obtaining the prerogatives of an exclusive state religion, thereby presenting the most repulsive caricature of that theocratic ideal which hovered before the minds of the nobler natures of that age. Its rule was, fortunately, not of long duration. The prince-bishop besieged the apostate city. But in this very time of siege, fanaticism attained its acme. After the death of Matthiesen in a sally of the besieged, John of Leyden exercised unlimited authority as king. He was supported by twelve elders, in the character of the elders of the twelve tribes of Israel. Knipperdolling discharged the office of executioner. By his hand fell all who opposed the regulations of this new kingdom of God. A community of wives was forcibly established. The king himself had a harem containing sixteen women. In October 1534, the whole city celebrated a great love-feast, at which places for 4200 persons were made ready. Unleavened wheaten cakes were carried around in baskets and distributed amongst the guests, with the words: "Brother, sister, take this. As the grains of wheat are baked together, and as the grapes are pressed together, so we are *one*." After this ceremony, the hymn *Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'* was sung. During the feast, the king, who walked up and down among the long tables, espied an interloper in the person of one of the German lanzknechts, who had been taken prisoner, and had been brought to the entertainment by his host. The king, declaring that this

unfortunate man "had not on a wedding garment," himself struck off his head in the presence of the whole assembly.

The authority of the king was considerably strengthened by the revelations of a new prophet, who arose in the beginning of September—we refer to John Dusentschuer, a goldsmith of Warendorf. He it was who, moved by a prophetic spirit, had proclaimed John of Leyden king of the new Jerusalem, declaring that he "should occupy the throne of David until the Father should claim the kingdom from him."

Without pursuing the subject further in its intermediate details, let us turn our attention to the tragical issue of this affair. The Prince-Bishop of Waldeck became convinced that it would be impossible for him alone to conquer the rebellious city. Nor did the help of his allies—the Archbishop of Cologne and the Dukes of Jülich and Cleves, to whom he was referred—suffice for the purpose. Further aid was necessary. In the middle of December 1534, a Westphalian Dietine was convened at Coblentz, at which the Elector of Saxony was present. The members of this assembly feeling still unable to cope with the defenders of Münster, King Ferdinand was requested to convoke an imperial Diet at Worms. The Diet assembled, and made a grant of one hundred thousand florins to assist in defraying the expenses of the war. It was, however, a Protestant prince who turned the scale in favour of the besiegers. This prince was the Landgrave Philip, who, by the peace of Cadan, stood pledged to Ferdinand to lend his aid in besieging Münster. This promise he was able conscientiously to make and to fulfil, as the success of the beleaguerers involved the subjugation not of brethren of the Evangelical faith, but of a fanatical sect, whose victory might be as dangerous to Protestantism as to Catholicism. So, in April 1535, the landgrave sent a portion of his troops, on their return from Wurtemberg, to join those of the emperor and the bishop. The new Jerusalem was surrounded on every side, and all supplies

were cut off. Famine speedily set in, with all its horrors, as in the times of the beleaguerment of the Holy City under Titus. The flesh not only of horses, but also of dogs, cats, and rats, was eaten, and leather was chewed, strips being torn even from the bindings of Bibles to satisfy in some little measure the cravings of hunger. It was no wonder that the faith of the besieged began to fail. But woe to those who ventured upon any expression of their unbelief! When (in the beginning of the famine) one of the king's wives uttered a doubt as to whether it could be the will of God that the people should die of hunger, while the king revelled in luxury, the king seized her, dragged her to the market-place in the midst of the assembled people, caused her to kneel, and with his own hand struck off her head; then, spurning the headless trunk with his foot, he forced the rest of his wives to sing, "Glory be to God on high." It was scoffingly proposed to those who were so weak from hunger as to be unable to stand, that they should dance with the king; for sorrow, declared their persecutors, should be mingled with joy. Finally, on the 24th of June 1535, the city, through treachery, fell into the hands of its besiegers. Two burghers of Münster conducted several hundred lanzknechts by night over the ditches and ramparts into the city, overcame the guards, opened the city gate, and pressed forward to the cathedral. The dismayed inhabitants, starting from their beds, flocked together to oppose the invaders. The conflict was continued within the city, thousands falling on both sides. It was not until the fourth day after the capture of Münster that the prince-bishop celebrated his triumphal entry. Rottmann met with an opportune death in the heat of the struggle,[1] but John of Leyden and his councillors and attendants were taken prisoners and placed in irons. The city was given up to plunder. A number of executions took place, the unfortunate victims being hanged in rows.

[1] As his body was not found, it was afterwards reported that he had escaped, and that he ended his days at a nobleman's castle in Friesland.

Knipperdolling's wife, on refusing to abjure her faith, was beheaded on the 7th of July. No such easy death was accorded to her husband. He, in company with John of Leyden and John Krechting, former counsellor of the king, was reserved for the choicest tortures. The landgrave had vainly endeavoured, through the medium of his theologians—Anthony Corvinus and John Kymeus—to bring these men to an acknowledgment of their error and to repentance for their sin. They were condemned to the painful punishment of being dragged about for a year from one place to another, amid the laughter and derision of the populace. Finally, they were brought back to Münster, there to die a horrible death on the spot where their atrocious deeds had been committed. One after another, for the space of an hour, in the open market-place, they were tortured, by having their flesh torn off with red-hot pincers, until they either expired in consequence of their sufferings or were strangled by the executioner. Their bodies were then placed upright in iron cages, and fastened to the tower of the church of St. Lambert, "for a warning and terror to all unruly spirits."

And how fared the city itself? Not only did it lose its civil liberties, but also its evangelical freedom. Catholic worship was restored in all the churches, and the monks and nuns who had formerly been driven from the cloisters took possession of them once more. It is a remarkable fact that the bishop, by whose authority these changes were effected, was by no means one of the persecuting hierarchs of the Church; he was even, like Bishop Hermann of Cologne, inclined to favour Evangelical principles. In all ages, however, it has been seen that a horror of degenerate liberty or licence not infrequently brings true liberty itself into disrepute even with the noblest minds. As Dr. Hase says, "Protestantism, by its inconsiderate acts, had lost all right and power in those parts." The Evangelicals no longer dared open their mouths. The fall of Münster was followed, moreover, by persecutions of the Anabaptists, and, with them, of Protestantism, in various other

places.[1] Luther remarked that "God had chased out the devil, but the devil's grandmother had come in."[2]

[1] Luther writes as follows to the Elector John Frederick (May 1536):—"The priests cannot rest, and are fortified by the wretched fall of Münster in their determination to exterminate Protestantism in every place. May God defeat their purpose. Amen" (DE WETTE, iv. No. 1713).

[2] HASE, *Neue Propheten* (*Das Reich der Wiedertäufer*), p. 261. Besides this work, in which may also be found, pp. 352 sqq., a list and critique of sources, comp. DORPIUS, *Die Wiedertäufer in Münster, zur Geschichte des Communismus im 16 Jahrhundert neu herausgegeben von Menchmann*, with an introduction by Gelzer, Magdeburg, 1847; JOCHMUS, *Geschichte der Kirchenreformation in Münster und ihres Unterganges durch die Wiedertäufer*, Münster, 1826; HAST, *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in Münster*, Münster, 1836; RANKE, *l.c.* iii.; KLIPPEL, in Herzog's *Realenc.* x. pp. 93 sqq.; C. A. CORNELIUS, *Die niederländischen Wiedertäufer während der Belagerung Münsters*, 1534–1535, Münster, 1869, iv.

CHAPTER XXVII.

PAUL III. AND HIS LEGATE VERGERIO—DIET OF SCHMALKALDEN—MEDIATORY EFFORTS OF MARTIN BUCER—ENDEAVOURS TO PROCURE A UNION—FIRST HELVETIC CONFESSION—LUTHER'S INCLINATION FOR PEACE—CONCORDIA OF WITTENBERG—SCHMALKALDIC ARTICLES—TRUCE OF FRANKFORT—DEATH OF GEORGE OF SAXONY—INTRODUCTION OF THE REFORMATION IN LEIPSIC, BERLIN, AND HALLE.

IN the midst of the disorders which occupied our attention in the last chapter, and before the occurrence of the promised council, Pope Clement VII. died on the 25th of September 1534. He was succeeded in October by Paul III., of the house of the Farnese. This man, who, at the time of his elevation to the pontificate, was sixty-six years of age, was the possessor of much worldly wisdom. He zealously advocated the proposed council, and declared that he would not rest until he had brought it to pass. He also seemed inclined to favour the views of the Protestants to as great an extent as could be expected from a pope. Paul Vergerio, the legate whom he employed, was an exceedingly clever, enlightened, and liberal man, and himself became subsequently a convert to Protestantism.[1] In November 1535, Vergerio, after making some stay in Vienna and Berlin, arrived in Saxony, accompanied by a numerous retinue. At Wittenberg he had an interview with Luther, who frankly expressed to him his sentiments in regard to the council. The elector was absent at this time, on a journey to King Ferdinand. Vergerio followed him and

[1] SIXT, Ch. H., *Petrus Paulus Vergerius, päpstlicher Nuncius, katholischer Bischof und Vorkämpfer des Evangeliums*, Braunschweig, 1855.

found him at Prague on the 30th of November. He informed him of the pope's readiness to hold a council with which the Protestants themselves might be satisfied. The elector refrained from giving an independent assent to the papal plans, but referred the legate to the approaching assembly of the Protestants at Schmalkalden on the 6th of December. This convention received the legate with all due honour; its members expressed their readiness to take part in the council, but regretted that it was not to be held in a German city, great stress being laid upon this objection. New obstacles, however, now opposed the convocation of the council. The vacancy of the Duchy of Milan occasioned a fresh outbreak of hostilities between Charles V. and Francis I. The Schmalkaldic Alliance meantime was gaining in strength and importance. Dukes Parnim and Philip of Pomerania, and Duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg, had joined the league; it was further strengthened by the accession of the Count-Palatine Ruprecht von Zweibrücken, Princes George and Joachim of Anhalt, Count William of Nassau, and several German cities—viz., Augsburg, Frankfort-on-the-Main, Hamburg, Braunschweig, Gosslar, Hanover, and Göttingen. A renewal of the alliance for ten years was first proclaimed. The league was now capable of maintaining an army of 10,000 footmen and 2000 cavalry soldiers. Both French and English ambassadors attended the meeting of the alliance, and expressed a disposition to favour its plans.

All this was encouraging. Still, however, there were excluded from the alliance those who, on account of their different views of the Lord's Supper, were regarded as Sacramentarians. But was no understanding between the two parties possible? At least there were not wanting efforts to accomplish such a result. A man was found who seemed to possess the gift of mediation in a high degree. It is a pity that the good-will of one of the parties concerned was lacking in perfect penetration and energy, and that the energy of the other party was deficient in good-will—qualities which are at

all times requisite in order to the accomplishment of a real *union*. Let us take a nearer view of the individual whose sad lot it became to win the thanks of neither party and to excite the suspicions of both.

Martin Bucer[1] was the son of a cooper, named Klaus Butzer, and (like Socrates) of a midwife. He was born at Schlettstadt in Alsace in the year 1491, and attended the excellent school of that city. When he was but fifteen years old, he entered the order of the Dominicans, in compliance with the wishes of his grandfather. He soon succeeded in having himself transferred to Heidelberg, for the purpose of pursuing his studies at the University there. Following the Humanistic tendency, he became, like most of the superior minds of the age, an admirer of Erasmus. Luther's attack upon Tetzel made a still deeper impression upon him, however—an impression which was confirmed and strengthened by the appearance of the former at Heidelberg in 1518, when Bucer was one of those who gathered around the welcome guest at the disputation. From that time his heart clung to the Reformer of Wittenberg, whose writings (especially the *Commentary on Galatians*) exerted an ever-increasing influence over Bucer's theological studies, and whose fortunes he watched with intense interest. Luther, on the other hand, hoped great things from the promising youth, who, he declared, was "the only brother without guile" in the Dominican order (which, as we well know, was not favourably disposed towards Luther).[2] The time at last arrived when Bucer withdrew from this order and laid aside the cowl, feeling it to be a burden. He was released from the obligations of the brotherhood by the suffragan-bishop of

[1] So called from the Latinized form of his name (Bucerus). His real name was Butzer (*Putzer* [Cleaner], *Emunctor*). From the Greek form, Βουκήρος, arose the idea that he was called "Kuhhorn" [Cow's-horn]. Comp. BAUM (in vol. iii. of the *Väter und Begründer*, etc.), Elberfield, 1860, and SCHENKEL'S article in Herzog's *Realenc.* pp. 412 sqq.

[2] See Luther's letter to Spalatin, dated 12th February 1520, DE WETTE, i. No. 201.

Speier, Anthony Engelbrecht, in a formal document given at Bruchsal on the 29th of April 1521. Previous to this, through the mediation of Francis von Sickingen, he had become court chaplain to the Count-Palatine Frederick at Heidelberg. After having occupied several positions[1] and married, he received, at Easter 1523, an appointment at Strassburg, where Zell and Capito were settled. His labours as a Reformer in the latter city have been elsewhere referred to, and we have now to do simply with his attitude in regard to the sacramental controversy.

At the first outbreak of this controversy, Bucer expressed his regret that men "should be disputing about the carnal presence of Christ, instead of simply taking comfort in His sacrificial death by a believing participation in the sacrament. . . . Where the Lord is truly remembered, there is no room for concern about the bread and wine; the whole heart and all the powers of a man will be bent upon proclaiming and extolling the Redeemer's death."

Bucer was present at the Conference of Bern and also at that of Marburg. When Luther saw him at the latter place, he is said to have shaken his finger at him, exclaiming, "Thou art a rogue." At the Diet of Augsburg, it was he who, in the Confession of the four cities, gave expression to the opinions of those cities, or more especially to his own opinion and that of Strassburg. He had a conference with Luther at Coburg, the result of which was, that at the Convention of Schweinfurt, in the year 1532, Strassburg was received into the Schmalkaldic League.[2]

But the more Bucer, actuated by the best intentions and the sincerest love of truth, accommodated himself to the Lutheran modes of expression, so far as his conscience would

[1] He preached for some time at Landstuhl, and then accepted a call to Weissenburg, whence he was subsequently expelled. He had at first no definite appointment at Strassburg, but lectured on the Bible in the chapel of St. Laurence, of which Zell (since 1518) was pastor.

[2] The city subscribed the Confession of Augsburg without withdrawing from the *Tetrapolitana*.

permit, the more unfavourably was he regarded by the Swiss, who viewed his pliancy as weakness, or rather a betrayal of the truth. The Bernese uttered warnings against the "limping Strassburger." And indeed, if we call to mind how Luther continued to disparage the memory of Zwingle, we shall be able to comprehend the position of the Swiss. For instance, in a letter to Duke Albert of Prussia, written in 1532,[1] Luther warned the duke not to tolerate the Zwinglian doctrine in his territories; which advice the Zurichers justly regarded as a breach of the treaty concluded at Marburg. Luther protested that he would have no fellowship with the "fanatics." "I shall," he writes, "henceforth have nothing to do with them, and leave them to the judgment of God." He again announced his belief that the disastrous affair at Cappel was a divine judgment upon the Zwinglians. He also expressed his astonishment that the followers of Münzer and Zwingle were not turned from their sinful course by such chastisements, and that they not only manifested a hardened persistence in their error, but even claimed that their chastisements were those of martyrs, and went on vindicating their own conduct and likening themselves to the holy martyrs. He made use of similar expressions on other occasions, and was, in short, determined not to yield a finger's breadth.[2]

What a difficult task was that of Bucer, with this iron will in opposition to him! From the outset, Luther declined the mediatory overtures of Bucer. In 1531 (22d January)[3] he frankly told him that he could not consent to any concord without doing violence to his conscience and sowing the seeds of far greater discord. To Duke Ernest of Lüneburg he

[1] Probably in April. See DE WETTE, iv. No. 1445.

[2] In 1534 he wrote to Justus Jonas as follows (DE WETTE, iv. No. 1613):— "Ego de mea sententia cedere non possum, etiam fractus illabatur orbis, impavidum me ferient ruinæ." And again in an opinion (*ibid.* Nos. 1614, 1615): "And, finally, this is our opinion, that the body of Christ is truly eaten *in* and *with* the bread, and that all that the bread does and suffers is done and suffered by Christ's body, that body itself being distributed, eaten, and *crushed with the teeth*."

[3] DE WETTE, iv. No. 1347.

wrote in a similar strain,[1] saying, "Such an agreement would doubtless result in a worse condition of affairs than at present exists." Bucer threw off much of the burden of his task of peace-making by declaring that the controversy was a battle about mere words. This Luther would by no means admit; yet he himself, in his calmer moments, thought it would be well "if both sides would desist from writing."

We might cite from the letters of Luther many more passages in which he expresses grave scruples as to the expediency of any attempts to realize a union, objecting that all such attempts were lacking in internal harmony.[2] In February 1535, however, he wrote to Philip of Hesse:[3] "Thank God, I have attained to the comfortable hope that there are many among them" [those who differed from him in their views of the Lord's Supper] "who are true-hearted and earnest-minded men; *therefore I am now more inclined to an amicable agreement, one that shall be thorough and permanent.*" His doubts as to the possibility of such an agreement had not disappeared even then; but if such an one should be effected, he would be ready to say with Simeon, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace."

How, it may be asked, was the peace-loving Melanchthon disposed at this juncture? His position was a peculiar one. He would on no account offend Luther. But he confessed to the landgrave, in a letter of September 1534, that he took no pleasure in the unfriendly writing and clamouring, "on our part," but had always been, and still was, pained to the heart thereby. "I would gladly," he continues, "have assisted in labouring to establish a Christian concord. But after meeting with exceeding hardness, whence an increase of pain to others resulted, I have left the matter in God's hand."[4]

[1] De Wette, iv. No. 1349.

[2] In December 1534, he wrote as follows to Justus Jonas:—"*Ego quo plus cogito, hoc fio aleniore animo erga istam concordiam deperatam, cum ipsi inter se sic varient*" (De Wette, iv. No. 1616).

[3] De Wette, iv. No. 1628.

[4] For further particulars, see Schmidt, *Melanchthon*, pp. 311 sqq.

Let us now follow the footsteps of Bucer as he traverses this thorny region, and observe with what indefatigable patience he devoted himself to the business of mediation. In May 1533 he visited Zurich, wishing to defend himself, at a convention of preachers assembled in that city, against the accusation of double-dealing, and to conjure the Zurichers not to write against Luther. It was desired that the Swiss and the Upper German theologians should first come to an agreement among themselves. For this purpose a meeting was called in mid-winter at Constance, in December 1534. The Swiss, however, did not make their appearance, some pleading sickness, and others the bad weather, in excuse for their absence; none but deputies from Augsburg, Memmingen, Kempten, Isny, Lindau, Biberach, and Constance were present. It was agreed that for *believers* the true body and true blood of Christ are present in the Lord's Supper, but that *unbelievers* do not partake of Christ's body. With this deliverance Bucer hastened to Cassel, undeterred by the bad roads of mid-winter. He there conversed with Melanchthon, who, in January 1535, communicated the result of the conference to Luther at Wittenberg. A plan for an agreement was next drawn up, in which, that all might be as well satisfied as possible, a sacramental union of the bread and the body of Christ was set forth. This expression, it was thought, would attract the Swiss. As the latter had not attended the meeting at Constance in December 1534, another conference was appointed to take place at Aarau at the end of the year 1535. This was attended by Leo Juda and Bibliander of Zurich, and Oswald Myconius and Simon Grynæus of Basel. The Aarau conference was, however, but preparatory to a larger convention in the Augustinian cloister at Basel in January 1536. At this were present, beside the Zurichers, deputies from Bern, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Mühlhausen, and Biel. Specially observable among those who took part in this conference were Bullinger, Myconius, Grynæus, Leo Juda, and Megander. Bucer did not fail to travel thither from Strassburg, and

Capito accompanied him. The only result attained after lengthy debates was the acknowledgment of a true communion with the body and blood of Christ, with the distinct stipulation, however, that this expression was not to be apprehended as signifying a local presence in the bread. It was agreed that a Confession of Faith should be drawn up and communicated to Luther. This Confession, which treats not only of the Lord's Supper, but also of all the essential points of faith, was the *First Helvetic Confession,* called also the *Second Confession of Basel,* because it was composed at Basel, which city had already put forth its own particular Confession in 1534.[1] Without delay, Bucer now proceeded to Eisenach, hoping to meet Luther there; he, however, found only Melanchthon, Luther, who had travelled as far as Grimma, having excused himself on the plea of illness. The theologians in session at Eisenach, from Strassburg, Hesse, Saxony, and the Upper German cities, resolved to repair to Wittenberg, for the purpose of continuing the negotiations with Luther in due form, and a preliminary agreement was at length arrived at, which received the name of the *Concord of Wittenberg.*

Luther was in a softer mood than usual. The main difficulty continued to be, whether the unbelieving partake of the body of Christ. This was the surest criterion of a purely objective understanding of the matter under discussion,—this the chasm which was continually reopening, however diligent the effort to cover over all gaps between the views of the different parties. But a lucky inspiration caused Luther to exclaim, "After all, why should we quarrel about unbelievers? We receive you as brethren in Christ," and he stretched forth his hand in token of peace. He retained the same opinion as before, but no longer regarded that opinion as sufficiently important to be a cause of wrangling between himself and those who thought otherwise. A union was very far from being effected, but an understanding, a mutual toleration, was arrived at.

[1] See chap. xxiv.

What a weight was lifted from Bucer's spirit by this declaration! With tearful eyes and folded hands he gave thanks to God. He was ready at once to communicate the happy result of his efforts to the Swiss, and first of all to the brethren at Basel. The Swiss, however, were not prepared to strike hands at once upon this agreement; they discovered all manner of catches and hitches in the terms employed. And who can blame them for their caution? They did not wish to be surprised into unintentional concessions, nor would they entrench themselves behind ambiguous formulas. In the meantime the Second Basilian (First Helvetic) Confession was communicated to Luther through the medium of Bucer. Luther expressed himself favourably in regard to this Confession, even admitting at last that though "the great dissension could not be healed without leaving seams and scars, yet if both parties were in earnest and made diligent prayer to God, He would in time cause the difference to die out, and the troubled waters to become calm."

Two memorials of Luther's peaceful mood—which, alas! was but too transient—have come down to us, and from these it gives me pleasure to cite some passages. One of the memorials in question is a letter to James Meyer, burgomaster of Basel, dated 17th February 1537; the other is an epistle to the Reformed cantons of Switzerland, of the 1st of December in the same year.[1]

Luther, in his letter, assures Burgomaster Meyer of his approval of the document transmitted to him (the Second Confession of Basel). He had observed in it, he states, an earnest desire for the furtherance of the cause of Christ's gospel, and he prays that "God will give us grace that we may all agree together in true and sincere harmony, and in assurance and unanimity of doctrine and opinion, to the end that, as St. Paul says, we may with one heart and one mouth praise God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and forgive

[1] De Wette, v. Nos. 1760 and 1784.

and bear with one another, as God the Father forgives us and bears with us in Christ Jesus." It is no wonder, Luther further declares, that the differing parties had attacked each other somewhat severely, as the matter about which they had been contending was not jest, but earnest. He recommends, however, that all wounds and bruises should be forgotten, and that all should endeavour, by prayer to God, to strengthen themselves in the spirit of love. "We will not fail to do our part," he continues, "if your people will but refrain from frightening away the birds of concord, and will faithfully endeavour with us to promote peace. *The affair will not accommodate itself to us; we must accommodate ourselves to it;* then God will give us His aid and His presence." Luther had conceived a particular liking for this burgomaster of Basel. On the Thursday after *Reminiscere* (the second Sunday in Lent) in the same year (1537), being in Gotha upon his return from Schmalkalden, he remarked to Bucer and Lykosthenes: "If I should die, take counsel of the letter which I wrote to the burgomaster of Basel, *whom I like, and whom I regard as a pious and faithful man.*"[1]

In his epistle to the Confederate States (Zurich, Bern, Basel, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Mühlhausen, and Biel) Luther makes use of an expression which he had once found fault with when employed by Zwingle, viz.: "The Holy *Spirit* must operate in our hearts; the *external word* alone is not sufficient." He also says that he will not insist upon the idea that Christ comes down from heaven into the bread; he will leave the *manner* in which His body and blood are given us to divine omnipotence; it is unnecessary to conceive of any ascension or descension; we may simply abide by the words, "*This is my body.*" Upon this condition he was ready "to offer heart and hand to the Swiss, and to maintain friendly relations with them, in order that worse evil might not ensue." For his own part he was disposed to "banish all resentment from his heart;" he only feared that Satan, the enemy of concord,

[1] *Tischreden*, Erlanger ed., iv. chap. vii. p. 123.

would be able to find servants of his who would "cast trees and rocks in the way" of peace.[1]

We come now to the cordial conclusion of the letter, which is as follows:—"Herewith I commend you and yours to the Father of mercy and consolation. May He give His Holy Spirit both to you and to us, that our hearts may be fused together in Christian love and Christian designs, and that we may be cleansed from all scum and rust of human and devilish malice and suspicion, to the praise and glory of His holy name and the salvation of many souls, as well as to the confusion of the devil and the pope and all their adherents. Amen."

Let us now return to the negotiations of the German Protestants with the emperor and the pope.

Paul III. had meantime, in 1536, actually appointed the council to be held at Mantua. In February 1537 the Evangelical states again assembled at Schmalkalden, and were visited, while in session, by the Papal legate, Van der Vorst (Vorstius), and the imperial vice-chancellor, Matthias Held. Luther's advice was to attend the council; he declared that he was not afraid of that "hempen hobgoblin" [*Hanfputzen*], and occasion, he said, should not be given to charge the Lutherans with being the cause of the council not coming to pass.[2] Notwithstanding Luther's advice, the elector and the states declined the invitation, thanking the emperor for his good-will. It was, however, resolved to transmit to the council a Confession, which Luther, by desire of the elector, had prepared in German. This document certainly could not be censured, as the Confession of Augsburg had been, for "stepping softly." Luther advanced with so bold and firm a tread that the earth groaned beneath him. Without any figures of speech, he called the pope Antichrist, maintaining

[1] He showed himself sufficiently unprejudiced to recognise the good in the Swiss churches, especially in reference to the administration of church discipline and excommunication.

[2] See DE WETTE, v. No. 1759.

that it was as great a shame to bestow upon him the appellation of Master as to give that title to the devil, whose apostle he was. With equal plainness the Reformer styled the mass an abomination and the devil's dragon-tail, that had called into being a vast quantity of vermin and filth, etc.

These "Articles of Schmalkalden"[1] were subscribed on the 15th of February by all the Saxon, Hessian, and Swabian theologians present, and also by those of Strassburg, and were subsequently numbered among the symbols of the Lutheran Church. Melanchthon could not join in the tone in which Luther spoke of the pope. Upon his own responsibility he drew up an additional article, in which he testified his readiness to yield the highest place in the Church, *by human right*, to the Bishop of Rome, so soon as the latter should give free course to the gospel. Luther was unable to attend the conferences in person. He was attacked by a malady from which he frequently suffered, and, as he grew no better, was taken to Wittenberg in one of the elector's carriages. After taking his seat in the vehicle, he exclaimed to the friends who had gathered about him, "May God fill you with hatred to the pope!"

Chancellor Held, finding that he could make no impression upon the Evangelical states, visited the various Catholic courts of Germany, and endeavoured to establish a counter alliance amongst these. Success attended his efforts. On the 10th of June 1538, the so-called "Holy Alliance" was concluded, for a period of eleven years, between the emperor and his brother Ferdinand, the Archbishops of Mentz and

[1] They consist of three parts. The first and shortest part contains the articles in which the teaching of the Evangelicals *agreed* with that of the Church of Rome (the doctrines of the Trinity, and the incarnation of God in Christ). Part second treats more fully of the *differences* of doctrine (justification by faith, the mass, purgatory, pilgrimages, brotherhoods, relics, indulgences, invocation of saints, monkish congregations, the Papacy). Part third contains the articles "which we are at present discussing with learned and sensible men or amongst ourselves" (sin, law, gospel, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, power of the keys, confession, excommunication, consecration and vocation, marriage of priests, the Church, good works, cloister vows, human ordinances).

Salzburg, Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, and Dukes Eric and Henry of Brunswick. These princes entered into an engagement of mutual aid in case any of the Protestant states should venture to take up arms against any of the allies, or should incite the subjects of the latter to revolt. Before the Protestants received reliable information of the establishment of this alliance, they held a meeting at Brunswick, and conferred upon the measures to be taken to effect their own security in case of need. At this meeting Christian III., king of Denmark, the Counts of Tekelnburg, and the city of Riga were received as members of the Schmalkaldic League.

Through the mediation of the pope, a truce was proclaimed between the emperor and Francis I. soon after the conclusion of the Holy Alliance. In consequence of this truce the Schmalkaldic League lost the protection of France, whose policy now underwent a change. The Turks were at this time threatening Germany afresh, and there was again an urgent call for troops to repel the invader—a call which also demanded a speedy settlement of religious difficulties. Joachim II., elector of Brandenburg, offered his services as mediator on this occasion. His father, Joachim I., whom he had succeeded in 1535, had been a zealous Catholic; the son, however, was an adherent of the Evangelical doctrine, though not a member of the Schmalkaldic League. He accordingly assumed a mediatory position between the two parties. In February 1539, a peace meeting was held at Frankfort-on-the-Main, at which were present, besides the ambassadors of the emperor and King Ferdinand, the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Elector-Palatine, and plenipotentiaries from different Evangelical states. Melanchthon and Bucer were also in attendance. Each party accused the other of having violated the Peace of Nuremberg. After somewhat lenghty debates, a truce (*Austand*) was at last concluded for fifteen months, reckoning from 1st May 1539.

In the meantime a happy event for Protestantism took place in Saxony. Duke George, the old enemy of Luther and

the Reformation, departed this life on the 15th of April 1539. He died trusting in the grace of Christ. The pastor of Dresden endeavouring to persuade him to hold fast to the Epistle of James in matters relating to faith and good works, he turned to the Saviour and besought Him to have mercy upon him for the sake of His bitter sufferings and death. The Catholic party was plunged into consternation by the death of its most conspicuous representative. Duke Henry of Brunswick is said to have exclaimed that he would rather God in heaven were dead than Duke George. Shortly before his death, the duke, who had neither wife nor children living, sent councillors to his brother Henry, and declared himself ready at once to surrender the government to him if he would renounce the Lutheran religion and return to the Catholic Church. This Henry declined to do. George, on hearing of his brother's refusal, made his will, constituting Henry his heir, indeed, but only upon condition that the territory of which he was to become the ruler should continue Catholic, otherwise the dukedom should fall to King Ferdinand I. Fortunately for the Protestants, George died before the formal execution of the will, and Henry succeeded his brother without further trouble. Henry was a decided Protestant and a member of the Schmalkaldic League, which he had joined in 1537. In his own district of Freiburg he had already introduced the Reformation through the ministry of the court preacher, James Schenk of Wittenberg. The Reformed doctrines and practices were now at once set in operation in those portions of the dukedom where the iron will of George had hitherto suppressed them. At Leipsic, the feast of Whitsuntide 1549 was at the same time the birthday festival of the Evangelical Church in that city. The Elector of Saxony and the Wittenberg theologians were invited to be present on this occasion. Luther and Jonas preached. The people fell on their knees and with tears in their eyes thanked God for the victory of the gospel. On the 9th of July a prohibition of private masses and of the administration of the Lord's Supper

in one kind was issued. A visitation of all the churches throughout the dukedom, accomplished under the direction of Luther and the other theologians of Wittenberg, aided in completing the work of reform. Among the men who assisted in establishing the Reformation in Leipsic and its vicinity, those of greatest note, in addition to Joachim Camerarius of Bamberg, the pupil and biographer of Melanchthon, were Nicholas Amsdorf, Frederick Myconius of Gotha, Caspar Cruciger, a native of Leipsic,[1] etc. Henry did not long survive the joy of his work of Reformation. He was succeeded in 1541 by his son Moritz, to whom we shall revert at some subsequent period.

Joachim II., who had delayed introducing the Reformation into his territories solely from fear of his father-in-law, Duke George of Saxony, gave the gospel free course after the death of George. On the 31st of October 1539, he partook of the Lord's Supper in the Evangelical mode in the cathedral at Cologne-on-the-Spree (Berlin). The new order of things was carried into effect by James Stratner, court preacher at Anspach, and George Buchholzer, provost of Berlin.

At about this time some few Catholic princes also granted religious liberty to their subjects. Among those who thus acted were the Elector Louis, in the Upper Palatinate (1538), and the Elector (Cardinal) Albert of Mentz, in the districts of Magdeburg and Halberstadt (1539). It was only after long opposition that Halle, the residence of the archbishop and the second capital of the archbishopric of Magdeburg, was benefited by this tolerance.

As early as the year 1524, George Winkler, of Bischofswerda, had commenced preaching the Evangelical doctrines at Halle; but in 1527, however, he was summoned to Aschaffenburg by the archbishop, and there called to account for his teachings. On his journey homeward he was assassinated, and it was rumoured that the cardinal was privy to

[1] PRESSEL, *Caspar Cruciger*, Elberfeld, 1862.

the act.[1] The cardinal strove in other ways to hinder the success of the Reformation in his residence, but the will of the burghers was at length victorious. After an unsuccessful application to Dr. Pfeffinger at Leipsic, the Evangelicals of Halle turned to Justus Jonas, who accepted the call which they extended to him, recognising in it a call of Providence. On the evening of Maundy Thursday (14th April 1541) he arrived at Halle, accompanied by a person named Poach; and on the day following, which was Good Friday, he preached his first sermon in the recently-built church of Our Lady. The threats of the archbishop were in vain; and that magnate, perceiving that he could accomplish nothing thereby, at last left the apostate city and transferred his see to Mentz. Jonas continued to preach and, in conflict with other difficulties, to carry on the work of reform.[2] Wittenberg had at first lent him to the people of Halle for three years only—an arrangement of which frequent instances are to be found in the history of the Reformation. At the expiration of this time he was appointed "perpetual soul curate and superintendent."

The cordial interest taken by Luther not only in this pastoral choice, but also in general in the fortunes of individual churches, and the high estimate which he affixed to the office of an evangelical teacher or minister, which he believed to be associated with the most weighty responsibilities, may be gathered from a letter to the Council of Halle, a few words of which we will cite in conclusion of this chapter.[3] "It is a great grace and jewel when a city can with one heart sing the psalm, 'Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.' For I have daily and sorrowful experience of the rarity of this gift in cities and in the country. Therefore I could not refrain from writing

[1] See Luther's letter of consolation to the Christians at Halle, DE WETTE, iii. No. 846.

[2] PRESSEL, *Justus Jonas*, p. 77.

[3] Letter of 7th May 1545, DE WETTE, v. No. 2275.

to you of my joy on your account, or from beseeching and exhorting you, as St. Paul besought and exhorted the Thessalonians, 'that ye persevere in the same way,' and, as the apostle says, 'continually increase and become stronger.' For we know that Satan is our adversary, and that he cannot endure such a divine work in us, but goeth about seeking whom he can devour, as St. Peter says. Hence it is very necessary to be vigilant, and to pray that we may not be overtaken by him." Luther then speaks of preachers as follows: "I hereby commend to your Christian love, preachers, ministers [or deacons], and schools, and especially Dr. Jonas, whom, as ye know, we unwillingly suffered to depart from us; and I, for my part, would gladly have him near me again. They are precious,—such faithful, pure, and good preachers (as Jonas),—as we are daily convinced. God Himself esteems them precious, when He says, 'The labourers are few;' and St. Paul says, 'Here it is shown who is found faithful.' Hence he also commands that they should be held in double honour, and that they should be recognised as God's great and special gift, that the world may honour them, to its everlasting salvation"

CHAPTER XXVIII.

RELIGIOUS CONFERENCES AT HAGENAU AND WORMS—DIET OF REGENSBURG [RATISBON] — INTERIM OF REGENSBURG—THE BISHOPRIC OF NAUMBURG—HENRY OF BRUNSWICK—FURTHER SPREAD OF THE REFORMATION — HILDESHEIM, REGENSBURG, ETC.—COLOGNE AND MUNSTER—DIETS OF SPEIER AND WORMS—PROTESTANT DIET AT FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN—LUTHER'S JOURNEY TO EISLEBEN: HIS SICKNESS, DEATH, AND BURIAL.

IN the meantime fresh attempts were made to accomplish, if possible, a "lovely Christian" union between the two sundered religious parties in the empire. The emperor convoked an assembly at Speier, which, however, by subsequent order, was held at Hagenau, in Alsace, in the summer of 1540. The Protestant party was here represented by second-rate men; on the Catholic side Eck and Cochlæus were the principal speakers. Melanchthon left home for the purpose of attending this meeting, but was taken ill at Weimar, his indisposition being occasioned by mental pressure as much as by physical disorder. As it was feared that he would not recover, the elector sent in utmost haste for Luther; and it was then that the latter, as we have already related,[1] besought God for his friend with powerful prayer, and received him at the hands of the Almighty as a new gift. Melanchthon himself confessed to his friends that it was in this wonderful way that he escaped death.[2] In the conference at Hagenau the Catholics manifested an apparent readiness to make con-

[1] See vol. i. chap. xvi. p. 408.

[2] In a letter to Camerarius, *Corp. Ref.* vol. iii. p. 1077.

cessions, especially in the important doctrine of justification; they, however, persisted in demanding that the word "alone" (by faith, in the doctrine of justification) must be omitted, and to this the Protestants could not consent. In other respects matters were to be allowed to rest as they were. A similar assembly was held at Worms in the beginning of the year 1541. Previous to this latter meeting (in October 1540) the elector assembled his councillors and preachers at Gotha, where it was agreed not to yield one whit to the pope. The Elector of Brandenburg likewise charged his theologians to bring him back the word *sola* (*alone* by faith), or not to return at all. At the assembly at Worms the Papal legate, Thomas Campeggi, kept himself somewhat in the background, Granvella, the imperial minister, occupying the more prominent position. Among the Protestant theologians present were Melanchthon, Capito, Bucer, Osiander, Brenz, and also Calvin (from Strassburg). It was at this meeting that Melanchthon and Calvin became personally acquainted. The Catholic party was represented by Eck, Cochlæus, and Malvenda, a learned Spaniard. The assembly was opened with the utmost magnificence, but it failed to produce any profitable result. After the disputants had debated for three days on the subject of original sin,[1] an imperial rescript was issued on the 18th of January, dissolving the assembly at Worms, but ordering that the discussions should be resumed at Regensburg. On the 5th of April 1541, the Diet of Regensburg began its session. The landgrave of Hesse was among the first to arrive. He was mounted upon a magnificent fawn-coloured horse, and his proud bearing as he sat thus, surrounded by his trumpeters, so

[1] The difference between the views of the two parties consisted mainly in the fact that Eck did not regard sinful desire (*concupiscentia*) as actual sin, while the Protestant view represented by Melanchthon was in this respect, as in many others, the stricter of the two. The Protestant reporters of the assembly could not sufficiently praise the manner in which Melanchthon dealt with his opponent. They compared Melanchthon to the nightingale and Eck to the raven.

impressed the emperor as to cause him to exclaim, in his Netherlandish dialect, "As the steed is, so is the man!" [*Wie de Gaul, so de Mann!*] Soon afterwards, the Papal nuncio, Caspar Contarini, made his appearance. This envoy of the pope was a noble Venetian, tolerant in sentiment, and partially inclined in favour of the Evangelical cause, especially in respect of faith and justification, but so bound by his instructions as to be obliged to assume towards the Protestants an attitude which, compared with that of Granvella, was one of opposition.[1] The emperor exerted every effort to secure as amicable a settlement of the differences as possible. For speakers he selected men of moderation, choosing, on the Catholic side, Julius von Pflug, dean of Meissen, and John Gropper, doctor of theology at Cologne. With these was associated the inevitable Eck; he, however, fell ill during the course of the discussion, and quitted Regensburg before its close. On the Protestant side, Melanchthon, Bucer, and John Pistorius,[2] preacher at Nidda, in Hesse, were selected. Previous to the opening of the debate, the emperor summoned the six collocutors before him, extended his hand to each one, and charged them to speak freely and fearlessly, but to keep the proceedings secret. The presidents appointed by Charles were Frederick, the count-palatine, and the minister Granvella. Some deputies to the Diet were constituted witnesses. Granvella produced a document which, he affirmed, the emperor had had prepared by persons of integrity.[3] In this paper the

[1] See WEIZSÄCKER'S excellent article on Contarini in Herzog's *Realenc.* iii. pp. 148 sqq. "The most intrinsic distinction between the Italian and the German experience of the reformational current is illustrated in the fact that Contarini's view of faith, being, as it was, the product of calm, intellectual research, preserved an aristocratic impress."

[2] The son of this Pistorius subsequently returned to the Romish Church.

[3] "A written statement, composed, as your Majesty has been informed, by some learned and God-fearing persons, and presented to your Majesty." Various conjectures concerning the authorship of this document have been advanced. For a long time the above-mentioned Gropper was regarded as the author,—this was Melanchthon's view,—but Eck, Contarini, Bucer, and George Wicel (whom we shall have occasion to speak of again) have also been propounded as probable authors. Modern investigation has shown that the writer was assuredly Gropper,

doctrine of justification by faith is unhesitatingly commended as *sound*, faith being explained as an inward motion produced by the Spirit of God, and, conjointly with love, communicated (poured in) to the soul from above. More than this admission the Evangelicals could not demand. And yet it was no trustworthy foundation for a peace. The sharper-sighted espied in the conjunction of faith with love a snare to entrap the Protestants. The word *sola* would undoubtedly fall a sacrifice to such a connection. Notwithstanding this consideration, however, an agreement upon the article was arrived at with tolerable rapidity. Greater difficulty was experienced in the discussion of the more practical questions concerning the Church and its constitution, divine service, the sacraments, the marriage of priests, etc. The conference was terminated on the 2d of May. The two parties continued to differ except in regard to four articles, which related to the condition of man before the fall, to free will, original sin, and justification. These articles were, in reality, the most important from a doctrinal point of view; but that, for the time being, was not the predominant view-point. No agreement was arrived at in respect of the ten remaining articles. Of course, it was impossible for *Luther* to be satisfied with this Regensburg Interim, as the form of agreement was denominated, on account of its interimic character. In it the apple of his eye, the doctrine of justification by faith *alone*, was attacked. He called it "a vamped-up thing, poorly pieced and stuck together; a patch of new cloth upon an old garment, whereby the rent is made worse."[1] The Catholic princes also were

but that he was assisted by Gerard Volikruck (Veltwyck?), a young statesman who laboured under Granvella. The book was afterwards submitted to Bucer and Capito, and subjected to manifold alterations at the suggestion of the former. For further particulars, see GIESELER, *Kirchenq.* iii. chap. i. p. 311; and KLIPPEL, in Herzog's *Realenc.* xii. p. 593.

[1] See Luther's letter of 10th May 1541, to the Elector John Frederick (DE WETTE, v. No. 1987). "We hold," the Reformer continues, "that man is justified by faith, *without* any work of the law; this is our text and formula whereby we abide; it is short and clear; and the devil, Eck, Mainz, and Heinz may storm against it as they will." The composers of the Interim had cited in support of their view, amongst other passages, Gal. v. 6, where it

dissatisfied with the agreement, and even declined to accept the four articles agreed upon. The Dukes of Bavaria had from the outset been opposed to the whole project of union; they would have preferred cutting the knot with the sword. The emperor, therefore, found himself compelled, on account of the Turks, to revive the Peace of Nuremberg in his recess of the 29th of June. "The upholders of the Confession of Augsburg," it was declared in this recess, "shall not seduce any of the subjects of the Catholic[1] states from their allegiance, but no one shall be prevented from professing the religion of the former."

Among the participants in this unedifying transaction, there was no one who found himself in a more unpleasant position than Melanchthon. His love of peace had induced him to make concessions which, in many cases, were contrary to his theological convictions, and bitterly did he now reproach himself. "I am punished by God," he writes to Camerarius, "and suffer deservedly on account of my other sins, as well as for the readiness with which I lent myself to these worthless and dissolute counsels." And yet, with all his love of peace, he had failed to satisfy the emperor. Charles was displeased with

is declared that "in Christ neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but *faith*, which worketh by *love*." "This saying," Luther justly observes, "refers not to the *becoming* just, but to the *life* of the just." There is a great difference between *fieri et agere*, *esse et facere*, as schoolboys learn,—between the *verbum activum et passivum*. Becoming and doing are two different matters: "To become a tree and to bear fruit are two distinct things." See also the letter of 12th June to the Princes John and George of Anhalt (No. 1994). These princes, in conjunction with the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg and other states, had despatched a magnificent deputation to Luther from Regensburg, in the hope of securing his support for the union. He writes to them as follows:—"Granting, even, that his Imperial Majesty's intentions are altogether gracious and sincere, the [Romish] party are not seeking in earnest an agreement which shall be agreeable to God and in accordance with the truth. In making a pretence of so doing, they are trifling with his Imperial Majesty; for if they were in earnest, they would not fail in coming to an understanding upon the ten articles, for they are well aware that all ten are mightily and *in bona conscientia* condemned by the four upon which an agreement has been reached, and especially by the article on justification."

[1] The term *Catholic* appears here for the first time as the name of the anti-Protestant party. (The Protestants were content to be, and to remain Catholic; they objected only to being *Roman* Catholic.) Prior to this time the opponents of the Protestants were (more correctly) called *Papists*.

him because he had not conceded enough, and complained to the landgrave that Melanchthon had his arrows feathered by Luther. The Elector of Saxony, however, commended Melanchthon for his stedfastness.

The horizon now presented a gloomy aspect, and fresh complications arose. By the death of Bishop Philip of Naumburg-Zeitz (in January 1541), the episcopal see of that province was rendered vacant. The Elector of Saxony thereupon conceived it to be his duty to avail himself of this favourable opportunity to install a Protestant bishop in the vacant see, and thus to gain the province for the cause of the Reformation. The bishopric afforded a soil not unfavourable for his purpose. In the year 1520, a certain person named Pfennig had preached the Reformed doctrines in Naumburg, but had been obliged to flee to Bohemia. He had been succeeded by others—John Langer and John Cramer; Justus Jonas and Jerome Weller had also preached there at Easter 1536. At the time of the vacancy, the Evangelical pastor and superintendent Nicholas Mebler was labouring there, having occupied his post since 1537. This was the person towards whom the elector's thoughts first turned when the filling of the vacant see claimed his consideration. His action in the matter was, however, anticipated by the cathedral chapter. That body had for a time concealed the death of Philip, and, relying upon its corporate rights, hastily elected Julius von Pflug as his successor. The elector would not recognise this choice. By virtue of his own sovereign power he possessed himself of the episcopal prerogatives, and constituted Nicholas Amsdorf, the friend of Luther, and until then the superintendent of Magdeburg, administrator of spiritual affairs with the title of bishop. The installation of Amsdorf took place on the 20th of January 1542, in presence of the elector and a vast concourse of people. Luther performed the ordination in a simple manner, assisted by the pastors of Naumburg, Altenburg, and Weissenfels. Before the act the Latin hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus,* was sung, followed, at

the completion of the ordination, by the German *Herr Gott, dich loben wir* ["We praise Thee, Lord God"].[1] The canons were required to make oath that they would render obedience to the bishop, in accordance with the word of God and the command of Christ. Such of the nobles as resisted had their estates confiscated, and one was even cast into prison. Amsdorf, however, soon felt uncomfortable in his new situation, and sorely needed Luther's encouragement. He was subsequently released from so false a position by the Schmalkaldic War.

Still another act of violence was performed by the Evangelicals, to the further aggravation of their opponents. Duke Henry the younger of Brunswick, a bitter adversary of the Reformation,[2] had undertaken to chastise the city of Goslar, and had reduced it to the most desperate condition. Moved by indignation at the conduct of Henry, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse invaded his dominions in July 1542, and obliged him to take refuge with the Dukes of Bavaria. The Protestant princes then immediately introduced the Reformation in Brunswick, and declared that with their consent the exiled duke should never re-enter his dominions, which, however, they proposed to restore to his sons. The Imperial Chamber espousing the cause of the banished duke, the elector and the landgrave refused obedience to that court. Upon the entry of the victors into the conquered stronghold of Wolfenbüttel on the 13th of August, Dionysius Melander, court and field chaplain to the landgrave, celebrated the victory by preaching a sermon on Christ's entry into Jerusalem. Bugenhagen and Corvinus were summoned to assist in drawing up regulations for the state church, which was thenceforth to be Evangelical. A number of excesses were perpetrated here, as elsewhere.[3]

[1] Luther afterwards boasted that they had consecrated a bishop "without chrism, without butter, salt, lard, tar, grease, incense, or coals."

[2] It was against him that Luther wrote that intensely coarse treatise, *Wider Hans Worst.*

[3] In the cloister of Riddagshausen, on the 21st of July 1542, the altars and organs were destroyed, the coffers were broken open, chalices, monstrances, and

The neighbouring bishopric of Hildesheim at this time threw off the yoke of its bishop, Valentine Teutleben, and introduced the Reformed doctrines and practices into the Church, with the co-operation of Bugenhagen, who issued a form of church service in 1544.

Regensburg also, which had become better acquainted with Protestantism in consequence of the Diet of 1541, now turned decidedly to the Reformation. When the first Evangelical preacher, Erasmus Zollner, pastor of St. Emmeran's, by order of the council delivered his first sermon in the newly-built church on the 5th of February 1542, the concourse of people was so great that it became necessary to break down the new doors of the edifice.[1] In the same year, the count-palatine, Otto Henry, established the Reformation at Neuburg, availing himself of the advice and assistance of his court chaplain, Michael Diller, and Andrew Osiander of Nuremberg. In the territory of Cleves, Duke William had been favourable to the Reformation since the year 1539. Even the Bavarian dukes, the most decided opponents of Reform, were obliged to permit the reforming tendency to make a way for itself within their own borders.

Most remarkable of all was the course of affairs at Cologne. The Elector and Archbishop Hermann, Count of Wied by birth, had, in 1536, in company with the bishops of his province, held an ecclesiastical assembly at Cologne, when various plans of reform were proposed and the grossest abuses were abolished. All this might be effected within the pale of the ancient Church, and in accordance with its

mass vestments were stolen, the wafers were desecrated, the images were dashed in pieces, the inmates of the cloister were expelled, and the church was converted into a stable. Similar proceedings occurred at Gandersheim and elsewhere. See, besides, LENTZ, *Geschichte der Einführung des evangelischen Bekenntnisses im Herzogthum Braunschweig*, Wolfenbüttel, 1830; KOLDEWEY, *Die Reformation des Herzogthums Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel unter dem Regimente des Schmalkaldischen Bundes*, 1542–47, Hanover, 1869. Fresh sources of information were consulted in the preparation of the latter work, which is, moreover, written with much penetration.

[1] MARHEINEKE, iv. p. 219 (after Seckendorf).

principles; but in 1539 the archbishop proceeded still farther, and requested Melanchthon to furnish him with a written opinion. Finally, having been won over to the Reformation (in the Protestant sense of the term) by the conferences of Worms and Regensburg, he called Martin Bucer to Bonn, the archi-episcopal residence. The measures adopted by the archbishop excited the strenuous opposition of the cathedral chapter, and also of Gropper, although the latter was himself half in favour of the Reformation; the pope likewise expressed regret at the occurrences. In the further establishment of the Reformation at Cologne, Melanchthon played an important part, bringing the matter, in measure, to a conclusion by the Order of Reform which he issued.

Count Francis of Waldeck, bishop of Münster, who at first had opposed the cause of Reform in that city, but had subsequently been compelled to ally himself with Protestant princes in his conflict with the Anabaptists, also became a friend to the Reformation at this time, and in 1543 applied for admission into the Schmalkaldic League. In order to the consummation of the Reform in Münster, Osnabrück, and Minden, he extended a call to Hermann Bonn, rector at Lubeck.[1] Bonn prepared a liturgy in Low German. The canons at Münster, like those of Cologne, resisted the innovations.

Another Diet was convoked at Speier in the year 1544. The subject of aid against the Turks was again discussed, but was promptly thrust aside by the declaration of the Protestants, that before affording such relief they must be assured of a permanent peace and of equal rights with the Catholics. Through the mediation of the Electors of Brandenburg and the Palatinate, a recess of the following purport was secured. Religious controversy, it was declared, had arrived at such a height, and had occasioned such disorder in Germany, as to be susceptible of settlement by nothing save a general, free,

[1] See Luther's letter to Bonn, dated 5th August 1534, De Wette, v. No. 2155.

Christian council of the German nation. It was ordered that at a new Diet, to be held at Worms, the two parties should submit to each other plans of reform, upon which a friendly Christian agreement might be established. It was decreed that the Imperial Chamber should continue as it was for three years longer, but that within that time no fresh suits against Protestants should be undertaken. The Peace of Nuremberg, ratified at Regensburg, was to continue. In the administration of oaths, it should be optional with every person to swear either by God and His saints, or by God and His Holy Gospel.

The majority of the Catholic states were dissatisfied with this recess, and Cochlæus wrote an article against it. The pope was especially indignant thereat. "A host of evil spirits, actuated by hatred against the Romish Church, must," he wrote, "have led the emperor thus grossly astray at Speier; by this recess Charles has jeoparded his own soul and introduced confusion into the Church." The pope was particularly offended at the emperor's undertaking to appoint a council, that being the prerogative of the pope alone. He demanded that Charles should revoke all the unauthorized concessions which he had made to the enemies of the Church, and threatened the emperor with his lasting displeasure in case he should refuse obedience to this admonition. This deliverance of Rome against the emperor summoned Luther into the field once more. In 1545 he wrote the tractate entitled, *Wider das Papstthum, so zu Rom vom Teufel gestiftet.*[1]

By the Peace of Crespy, which Charles V. concluded with his rival, Francis I., on the 18th of September 1544, the emperor was enabled to devote more of his attention to the Protestant alliance. Under date of 15th March of the same year, the pope had appointed the long-desired council to take place at Trent; it was to have been opened in March of the ensuing year, but did not really begin until December. The

[1] This tractate was furnished with an illustration, in which the pope was represented as wearing ass's ears and surrounded by devils.

proposed Diet of Worms met in the beginning of 1545. As Charles was ill at the time, it was opened by Ferdinand, but was subsequently attended by the emperor himself. At the request of the Elector of Saxony, the Wittenberg theologians, with Melanchthon at their head, had prepared a new treatise, setting forth the principles of the Reformation, with special reference, moreover, to church government. This treatise was composed in a mild and judicious tone. Chancellor Brück thanked God that it bore no traces of Luther's clamorous spirit. In this document, which was entitled, *Wittenbergische Reformation*, considerable concessions were made to the authority of bishops; provided, always, that the latter set forth pure doctrine, that being represented as a prime necessity. The invitation to attend the council was persistently declined by the Protestants, who maintained that it would not be a free council. The emperor once more proposed a religious conference, to be held at Regensburg at the end of the year 1545, immediately before the opening of the Diet: this conference, which actually took place in the beginning of 1546,[1] was as fruitless as those which had preceded it. During the discussions, a great Protestant Diet was held at Frankfort-on-the-Main, attended not only by members of the Schmalkaldic League, but also by others professing the same faith. A feeling of uneasiness was everywhere prevalent. On all sides were rumours of warlike preparations on the part of the emperor.

In the midst of these preparations for war, Luther was removed from time to eternity. In the beginning of 1545 a report of his death had arisen in Italy, and was thence diffused. It was alleged that he had died suddenly, after partaking of the sacrament, and that he had previously directed that his body should be placed upon an altar and

[1] The speakers appointed on the Catholic side were Peter Malvenda, a Spaniard; Erhard Billicus, a Carmelite monk; John Hofmeister, an Augustinian; and Cochlæus. On the Protestant side, Bucer, Schnepff, Brenz, and G. Major were appointed.

worshipped as God—an order which, it was further declared, had been the means of restoring many to their senses and to the old faith. The book containing this fable fell into Luther's hands, and was reissued by him with a preface, in which he says: "And I, Martin, hereby acknowledge and testify that I received this wrathful fiction of my death on the 21st of March, and that I read it gladly and joyfully, with the exception of the blasphemous dedication of such a lie to the high Divine Majesty. Otherwise I am well pleased[1] that the devil and his tools, the pope and the Papists, hate me so heartily. May God turn them from the devil," etc.

Luther, towards the end of his life, had much to contend with at Wittenberg of an unpleasant nature. Among other things, he was vexed at the jurists' attempt to revive the Canon Law, which he had abolished and burned.[2] That, however, which most deeply grieved his soul was the worldly bias that the Reformation had received even in his own vicinity, so that many, trusting in the grace of God, were according too much liberty to the flesh. So indignant did he become, in 1545, at the excesses in Wittenberg, that he wrote from Leipsic to his wife as follows:—"Let us away from that Sodom! I would rather beg my bread than disquiet and torture my poor last days by beholding the disorderly doings at Wittenberg, and the proof which they afford that my toilsome but beloved labours have been in vain."[3] He actually quitted the city, purposing never to return, and repaired to Zeitz, to his friend Amsdorf, bishop of Naumburg. It was only through the entreaties of the elector that he was prevailed upon to go back to Wittenberg.

[1] [Literally, "it occasions a pleasant sensation in my right knee-pan and my left heel," etc.]

[2] [See chap. vi.—Tr.]

[3] See the letter to his wife, written at the end of July (De Wette, v. No. 2286). He prophesies no good to the city of Wittenberg, and fears that it will get neither St. Vitus' dance nor St. John's dance, but the Beggars' or Beelzebub's dance, as a punishment for its immorality and contempt for the Divine Word. See also the letter to the students of Wittenberg, 13th May 1543 (No. 2142).

Frequent illnesses had by this time considerably shattered Luther's physical strength, added to which he had undergone no little mental suffering, occasioned by the course of affairs in the Church of Christ. Amid all these trials, however, he preserved that joyousness of faith and that childlike spirit which so frequently excite our admiration as we contemplate his life. Nay, more, while an excessive vehemence occasionally disfigures the Reformer's character in the middle years of his life, in his old age we behold the ascendancy acquired by a certain tenderness of sensibility that often causes him to break forth in melancholy lamentation, and that, despite the harshness which he continued to exhibit toward some of his opponents,—the Sacramentarians, for instance,—endues him with a mildness and loveliness in which there is something of almost heavenly glory, and which speedily reconciles us to his occasional ill-humours. This peculiar tenderness now and then assumed the form of a momentary weariness of life—a feeling which, however, soon gave place to a higher trustfulness. Thus Luther says, in a sermon of 1545: "I am tired of the world, and the world is tired of me; it will therefore be easy for us to part company, as a guest leaves the inn where he has sojourned." And in the beginning of January 1546 he writes to a friend:[1] "I, an old, decrepit, sluggish, weary, cold, and now also one-eyed man, write to you—I, who had hoped that by this time rest would be vouchsafed me,—which, I think, would be reasonable,—am overwhelmed with writing, talking, doing, and acting, to as great a degree as if I had never acted, written, talked, or done anything before. But Christ" (thus he joyfully encourages himself) "is all in all to me; He can and does perform all things. Praise be to Him eternally." Luther had often said that he desired nothing more except a gracious death. His wish was now to be accomplished.

In the same month to which we have referred above, January 1546, he was summoned to Eisleben on some business

[1] To James Probst at Bremen (De Wette, v. No. 2310; Keil, p. 251).

concerning the Counts of Mansfeld. The affair was a secular one, relating to the mines; but the man of God was resorted to in this case also, as an arbiter between disagreeing brethren. His journey, on which he was accompanied by his three sons, was rendered very perilous by the freshets. In crossing the Saale he narrowly escaped drowning, and afterwards humorously recounted his adventures in letters to his wife and friends. To Jonas, his faithful companion, who was with him on the vessel, he said: "Dear Doctor Jonas, would it not have been a rare treat to the devil if I, Doctor Martinus, with my three sons, and yourself, had been drowned in the waters?" And from Halle he wrote, on the 25th of January, the following:[1]—

"Grace and peace in the Lord. Dear Kate, we arrived at Halle at eight o'clock to-day, but did not drive on to Eisleben, for there met us a huge Anabaptist, with billows of water and great cakes of ice; she covered the land and threatened to rebaptize us. We were prevented also from going back by the rising of the Mulda, and were therefore obliged to lie still at Halle, betwixt the waters. Not that we thirsted for them; on the contrary, we took some good Torgau beer and some good Rhenish wine, and therewith refreshed and consoled ourselves while we waited, hoping that the Saale would have its passion out. For as the servants and drivers, and we ourselves also, were apprehensive of danger, we were unwilling to commit ourselves to the water and tempt God; for the devil has a grudge against us, and he dwells in the water, and prevention is better than regret, and there is no need for us to prepare a fools' festival for the pope and his associates. I should not have thought that the Saale could make such an uproar, that it could storm over causeways and all as it does. I shall say no more at present, except, 'Pray for us, and be good.' I think, if you had been here, you would have advised us to do precisely as we are doing, and thus we

[1] De Wette, v. No. 2312. See also those other charming letters, Nos. 2315, 2317, 2318, 2320, 2322.

should for once have followed your advice. Herewith I commend you to God. Amen."

His faithful Kate manifesting constant anxiety concerning his health, he reproved her, sometimes in jest and sometimes in earnest, for so doing. In a letter of the 6th of February, from Eisleben, he recommends her to read the Shorter Catechism, of which she had once remarked that everything in the book was applicable to herself. "You would fain," he declares, "charge yourself with the affairs of your God, just as if He were not almighty and could not create ten Dr. Martins, if the old one should be drowned in the Saale. A truce to your cares! I have One who takes better care of me than you and all the angels could. He lies in the manger on His mother's breast . . . and yet sits on the right hand of God, the Almighty Father. Be at peace, therefore. Amen."[1]

The solicitude of Luther's wife was, however, not so unnecessary as the Reformer thought. His journey in the stormy weather had given him a severe cold, so that his old maladies returned. At the same time he laboured incessantly, not only in the suit committed to him by the princes, but also at ecclesiastical affairs, and preached besides four times, notwithstanding his indisposition. On Wednesday, the 17th of February, his illness made marked advances, and thoughts of a speedy departure thronged before his wearied soul. "What if I were to remain here at Eisleben, where I was baptized?" he said. At table he spoke much of death and immortality, and discussed the question as to whether departed spirits will recognise each other in another world. Soon afterwards he was attacked by pains which prevented him from enjoying any repose in bed, so that he flung himself on his couch or paced the room by turns. Rubbing with warm cloths, a remedy to which he had often before had recourse, afforded him but little relief. Physicians were summoned. Count Albert of Mansfeld and his wife visited Luther's sick-room,

[1] In the same letter he again jestingly refers to the devil, charging him with everywhere spoiling the beer with his pitch and the wine with his brimstone.

bringing with them various remedies. The Reformer's careful wife likewise sent medicines from Wittenberg. Jonas and Cölius, the preacher at Eisleben, stood, wavering between fear and hope, by the bedside of their friend, and united their prayers with his. "My heavenly Father," thus the Reformer prayed, "eternal and merciful God! Thou hast revealed to me Thy dear Son, our Lord Jesus Christ; Him have I taught, Him have I acknowledged, Him I love and honour as my dear Saviour and Redeemer, whom the wicked persecute, dishonour, and revile. Take my soul unto Thyself." He then said three times in succession, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit. Thou hast redeemed me, Thou faithful God!" after which he lapsed into silence. His attendants shook, rubbed, and fanned him, but he made no reply to their demonstrations. Finally his bosom friend, Jonas, bent over him and said in a loud voice, "Reverend father, is it your desire to die in the doctrine which you have preached?" to which the Reformer returned a vigorous "Yes!" and soon afterwards resigned his spirit to his Maker. He departed this life at four o'clock in the afternoon of the 18th of February 1546, in the sixty-third year of his age. His spirit will live for ever in the history of his people, his church, and humanity. Since, moreover, it is inherent in the nature and custom of mankind to treat the exanimate remains of the departed with the same respect that is due to the spirit that has fled, we may be permitted to add a few words in regard to the funeral of Luther, after which we propose to sketch briefly the fortunes of his surviving relatives. The princes with whom he was specially connected regarded the possession of the mighty dead as an honour, and contended for the right of giving him sepulture. The Counts of Mansfeld would gladly have kept him in Eisleben, where he was born and baptized. The Elector John Frederick of Saxony would not, however, consent to such an arrangement, but maintained that Wittenberg, the scene of his labours and struggles, should also be his resting-place. The body of Luther,

therefore, after having lain in state for some time, with solemn ceremonies, was enclosed in a tin coffin and transported to Wittenberg, with an escort of forty-five horsemen, at whose head rode the Counts of Mansfeld. The greatest interest was manifested at every place through which the funeral train passed. Bells were rung, processions issued forth to meet the illustrious dead, and dirges, interrupted by frequent sobs, were rather wailed than sung. The carriage which conveyed the remains was often obliged to halt by reason of the press. At Halle the concourse of people was especially great. The corpse was there received by the clergy, the council, and the youth from all the schools of the city. The march of the funeral cortege was impeded, the hearse was brought to a stand-still, and it was not until a late hour that the procession arrived at church, where the hymn, *Aus tiefer Noth schrei' ich zu dir*" ["From deep distress to Thee I cry"], was sung amid the sobs of the multitude. The coffin remained overnight in the sacristy, under a guard. On the 22d, Wittenberg was reached. At the Elster Gate, the same before which Luther had once burned the papal bull, stood the rector and professors of the University, the council, and the entire burgher population of the city, besides the deputies of the elector, the Counts of Mansfeld, about sixty knights, and many more princes and gentlemen who were studying at Wittenberg, all of whom escorted the illustrious dead to the castle church. The sorrowing widow of the deceased, seated in a mean little waggon, also followed the coffin, accompanied by her sons. Doctor Bugenhagen preached the funeral discourse, but was prevented from concluding by tears that drowned his voice. Melanchthon delivered a Latin oration. Near the pulpit in which Luther had taught, a grave had been prepared, into which the Reformer's coffin was lowered by Masters of Arts connected with the University.

Melanchthon had previously announced to his hearers the melancholy tidings of Luther's death. "Alas!" exclaimed he on this occasion, "the leader and chariot of Israel are taken

away; departed is he who hath led the Church in this last hoary age of the world." He further enlarged on the merits of Luther in the Latin oration which he delivered at the close of Bugenhagen's discourse. Upon the Elector of Saxony devolved the sad duty of despatching notices of Luther's death in all directions. The answers to these notifications make manifest the high esteem in which the Reformer was held by the Evangelical princes.[1]

A few words more concerning Luther's family.[2] After the melancholy issue of the Schmalkaldic War, his widow was compelled to leave Wittenberg. She removed to Leipsic, where she suffered extreme privation and was compelled to take boarders to gain a livelihood. Melanchthon, like a faithful friend, assisted her in her destitution to the utmost of his ability. She subsequently returned to Wittenberg; when, however, the plague broke out in that city in 1552, she set out with her children for Torgau, and in journeying thither met with an accident that hastened her end. The horses behind which she was travelling taking fright, she jumped out of the carriage and fell into a ditch, and from terror and cold contracted an illness which speedily resulted in death. She was buried in the parish church of Torgau, with many demonstrations of respect.

Luther left three sons and one daughter, several of his children having died in advance of their father. The three sons devoted themselves to three of the learned professions. John, the eldest, studied jurisprudence; the second one, Martin, embraced the study of theology; and Paul, the third son, chose the medical profession and became body-physician at the Saxon Court. The male line of Luther was continued through the youngest son only, and subsisted until the year 1759.

[1] For particulars see MARHEINEKE, vol. iv. pp. 349 sqq.

[2] Luther made his will in 1542, and the elector ratified it in 1546. It may be found in DE WETTE's work, vol. v. No. 2038. His portrait was painted by his friend Lucas Cranach, during the Reformer's life as well as after his death.

CHAPTER XXIX.

REVIEW OF LUTHER'S CHARACTER—OUTBREAK OF THE SCHMALKALDIC WAR—DIET OF REGENSBURG—PREPARATIONS FOR WAR—SEBASTIAN SCHÄRTLIN—DUKE MAURICE—BATTLE OF MÜHLBERG—CAPTIVITY OF THE ELECTOR OF SAXONY—SIEGE AND CAPTURE OF WITTENBERG—BUGENHAGEN—FORTUNES OF THE LANDGRAVE—MAURICE AT WITTENBERG—THE POPE AND THE COUNCIL.

HAVING accompanied Luther on his last journey, let us pause for a while beside his grave and look back upon that great life of his, so full of battles and so fruitful of blessing for others. Wherein, we would ask, consisted Luther's greatness? Did it lie in his learning? in the extent, the fulness, and depth of his knowledge? Erasmus was more learned than he; Melanchthon probably excelled him in learning; and many others, both before and after Luther, have surpassed him in point of attainments. It was never Luther's aim to acquire a reputation for learning, to promote the cause of science either as a whole or in its parts, or to supply the world with books. He was anything but an academic, a closet student, an author. Numerous though his printed works are, but few of them originated in a proclivity for authorship; the greater part were products of an agitated life, evidences of the Reformer's conflicts, depositions of his spoken words, or children of the moment. For literary fame, in the pursuit of which so many sacrifice repose and health, this son of a miner cared nothing. To Wolfgang Capito, who had possibly advised him to publish his works, he wrote [1] (9th

[1] DE WETTE, v. No. 1773.

July 1537) that he troubled himself very little about anything of that sort, and that, in fact, he was frequently attacked by a Saturnine hunger, which tempted him to devour his entire brood. To his tractate against Erasmus (*De servo arbitrio*) and his Catechism he did attach some little importance, and commissioned Caspar Cruciger to see if anything could be done with them (in a literary point of view). In the year 1539 the first volume of his German writings appeared, in the preface to which occurs the following:—"I should have been willing if my books had for ever remained in obscurity and perished, for the Holy Scriptures are already too much forgotten and abandoned for the books of men."

Or is it acuteness of perception, or inventive genius, that we admire in Luther? He was the inventor of neither gunpowder nor printing, nor did he discover a fresh path across the waters, or a new quarter of the globe, like Columbus and Vasco de Gama. His telescope searched out no hidden star in the heavens; his microscope descried no previously unknown plant or insect on the earth; no law of mechanics or physics is called by his name.

May we, then, behold in him the thinker who, in the invisible realm of the intellect, opened new paths for speculation or led the way to new views of supersensual matters? This last he certainly did, after his own fashion, without intending it. But philosophical thought, research, investigation, as such, was not his business. If the name of philosopher had been applied to him, he would have protested against it. We know in what estimation he held the "old storm-brewer," Reason, and her priestess, Philosophy, and what opinion he entertained of that master of thought, Aristotle; and Luther, judging thus, must be content if the wisdom of this world pass him by unheeded, and if the history of philosophy omit to mention him or notice him only as a psychological problem. If, however, he was not a theoretical philosopher, was he not a philosopher by practice—a genuine sage? Ask Luther himself whether he would have applied to himself the predicate

of *the Wise*, bestowed by history upon his gracious elector. If the wise man be distinguished by a judicious moderation in all things, by a clever calculation of the means whereby he endeavours to attain his purpose, by a uniform morality that might serve as a rule of conduct for others, no person will think of classing Luther with the wise men presented to our view in Hellenic antiquity or modern history. Luther did and said and wrote many things that might perplex a wise man. His speech and action were anything but in all points morally correct. He gave himself much liberty in jest and earnest, and in neither department will his words bear to be weighed by the goldsmith's scales. He is far removed from the perfectness of that man who offends in no word (Jas. iii. 2). Though many of his expressions which are displeasing to our ears cannot be condemned as immoral, yet they strike us as in a high degree unmannerly, unchaste, and rude. Whenever Luther is carried away by passion, the unmannerliness of which we speak actually lapses into immorality, inasmuch as a want of moderation constitutes a transgression of the bounds of morality. And yet, as *truly moral*, in the highest and noblest sense of the term, how far his colossal form towers above all the correct people of the mediocre class of morality—people who walk scrupulously and irreproachably along the beaten track of an inculcated virtue, in the polished surface of which they are reflected as in a mirror. It will perhaps be affirmed that the *religious* element outweighed the *moral* in his character, that he acted more from the promptings of pious impulses and moods than in accordance with moral principles which he had previously weighed and established. There is some truth in this statement. But while Luther did not pretend to be a model of morality in the sense which the wisdom of this world attaches to that expression, neither did he make any pretensions to *saintship* in the sense of the old Catholic Church or of modern Pietism. There *was* a time in his life when he did desire to be a saint, but that period lies far behind the time with which we are now concerned, and

that desire had long been overcome. The Luther in the cell at Erfurt, or on the staircase at Rome, is not the Luther whom we are at present discussing. All self-elected devoutness, all affectation of pious feelings, all self-tormentings of a gloomy asceticism, all monkery and all bigotry, were repugnant to his soul. He regarded such things as temptations of the devil, and did not hesitate to snap his fingers at the latter by indulging in a mirthfulness which was sometimes extravagant.[1] In this respect also he claims not to be a pattern for others. When he confesses that he is a poor sinner, and can frequently not find words sufficient to express his unworthiness in the sight of God, there is no pretence or affectation in his language; it is the sincere outpouring of the heart, free from all taint of hypocrisy or Pharisaism. It is this quality of manifest sincerity in Luther which wins for him the hearts even of men who are in the habit of regarding the language of the devout with suspicion.

The Roman Catholic Church has charged against Luther and the rest of the Reformers, among other things, the fact that they performed no miracles in proof of their mission; Luther, it has been declared, was not able to restore even a dead dog to life. Such charges could only provoke a smile from the Reformer. Aside from the fact that the renowned miracles of saints will scarcely bear the light of criticism, Luther attached no particular value to those miracles which it is customary to designate as special. In his eyes, everything was one great miracle of the goodness and omnipotence of God. "Special" miracles, he maintained, should point us

[1] Thus he advises Jonas von Stockhausen to combat his melancholy by saying to the devil: "Now then, devil, do not importune me. I cannot attend to your suggestions at present; I must ride, drive, eat, drink, or do thus and so; item: I must be merry now; come again to-morrow," etc. And to Joachim von Anhalt he writes in a similar strain: "I, who have spent my life in mourning and looking gloomy, now seek and take pleasure when I can. . . . It is true that pleasure in sin is of the devil, but pleasure in company with good, pious people, in the fear of God, in chastity and honour, though there may be a word or a jest too many, pleases God well" (De Wette, iv. Nos. 1488 and 1589). See also various consolatory epistles to Jerome Weller (Nos. 1227–1278, etc.).

to the "daily miracles of the wide world." The former he compared to the apples and nuts with which children are bribed. In holding these opinions, however, he did not presume to set bounds to the divine omnipotence, saying to God, "Thus far dost Thou go, and no farther." We know what confidence he reposed in prayer; and if any miracle is related of him, it is that miracle of prayer performed by the bedside of Melanchthon. Even in this connection, however, Luther lays no claim to the character of a miracle worker, and, as we have elsewhere observed, the occurrence should not be made use of to pamper the taste of miracle seekers.

Since, then, none of the categories which we have mentioned will serve as a frame to our picture of Luther,—since it is neither the man of learning, nor the philosopher, nor the sage, nor the saint, that we revere in him,—in our effort to classify him we must perhaps have recourse to the word *genius*, a convenient category which we are wont to employ whenever our ordinary standard for the measurement of greatness is insufficient. And it is, in truth, the presence of genius which impresses us when we contemplate the character of Luther. In whatever sphere of life we meet him, on whatever side we view him, flashes of intellect scintillate from him. His style may in some instances be ponderous, but he never becomes tedious. We are invariably refreshed if we read aught that has flowed from his pen, or hear any anecdote concerning him. The most unimportant things are handled by him, in his letters, in such a manner as to awaken our interest. We become interested in every individual who has once come in contact with Luther. And with what numbers in all ranks and classes of society was he brought into contact! Does not the peculiar charm of men of genius consist in the fact that they draw about them such a circle of acquaintances, who reflect something of their own brilliancy?

But now arises the further question as to what was the particular bent of Luther's genius. It will, perhaps, be said that his was a thoroughly *poetic* nature. And this is true. It

is not, however, to Luther as a *poet* that our thoughts fly as quickly as his name is mentioned. Some of his devotional songs—for instance, that powerful hymn, *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*, etc.—live, it is true, not only in the Church, but (it is so, at least, with the one that we have mentioned) in the nation. But of independent poetical productions, of artistic creations in the service of art, Luther neither was nor cared to be the author. Profoundly poetical as his whole nature was, as is manifest from his charming mingling of jest and earnest, the like of which is to be met with in no other man except Shakespeare, Luther was called to something else than poetry—we may with propriety say, to something higher. The poetical vein in his composition was ever in the service of the Reformer. Yet even as a poet, how superior Luther is to the other poets of his time, who either studied in Latin verses, imitated the ancient classics, or, in the broad and easy style of Hans Sachs, practised the master-song, giving birth to productions that were naïvely entertaining, but destitute of all elevation of sentiment. That which gives elevation to the poetry of Luther is, again, the religious element in his character. The Holy Scriptures were the source whence he drew inspiration as a poet, as well as in other capacities. The Psalms served as a model for his poetry and for the poetry of the Evangelical Church in general, whose leader in sacred song Luther is. We have already spoken of the influence which the translation of the Bible into the German vernacular exerted over the Reformer's prose and over German prose generally. It is, then, *a genius presided over by religion* and supported by a *German* spirit and nature, which so peculiarly affects us as we gaze upon Luther. He is the *man of faith* and the *German*, the man of the German people. The two characteristics are inseparably intertwined. If we remove Luther from the national soil upon which he stands, and behold in him only the possessor of a piety which, however earnest it may be, is a mere abstract quality, we are as far from having the *entire* Luther as though we were to strip from him his religious

character and regard him only as a *German*. What sort of Germanity, after all, is that in which a pious heart throbs not? Divest Luther's character of either its religious or its national impress, and the man becomes but a lifeless mask and his whole history a falsehood. Nay, it is not any abstract greatness that we reverence in Luther; it is Luther himself in his whole essence, in his complete and solid personality, before whom we involuntarily bare our heads, as did the thousands who witnessed the unveiling of the bronze statue of the Reformer at Worms, in 1868. Far be it from us, however, to worship Luther. To him, as to other great men, the proverb is applicable which declares that God has taken care that the trees shall not grow up to the sky. There are many shades as well as lights in his character, and the same quality that on some occasions seems to be a virtue, at other times assumes the aspect of a weakness.[1] His humility is not infrequently (though perhaps unconsciously to the Reformer) transformed into spiritual pride, his firmness becomes obstinacy, and his zeal for the faith develops into a passionateness which is well-nigh narrow-minded. Thus it was in the sacramental controversy. Moreover, the natural man, with his failings, ever and anon asserts himself in opposition to the new man, put on by Luther in faith, and so wonderfully glorified in the light of grace. Something of the peasant clung to the Reformer throughout his life, and he also retained some of his earlier monkish characteristics. The flaming sword of Gideon, with which, as the warrior of God, he struck terror to

[1] The polarity of his nature is well set forth by HASE, *Kircheng.* (9th ed.), p. 407: "The revolution of the times, at the head of which he had his station, was reflected, as a sharp antithesis, in his life. He regarded the pope (at different periods of his life) as the most holy and the most hellish father. In his passionate excitement, his feelings underwent some stormy changes. The concern of his life was the liberation of the spirit, and he contended zealously for the letter. He broke with history and expressed himself contemptuously in regard to the fathers of the Church, and yet took his stand upon ecclesiastical tradition. With his fulness of faith in Christ, he set himself above the Holy Scriptures, and nevertheless issued the command to throttle Reason. He opposed the storm of the revolution, trusting solely in the power of the Spirit, and occasionally recommended the drowning of the pope and his servants in the Tyrrhenian Sea," etc.

the hearts of his enemies, changes before we are aware into the stout cudgel of the Thuringian peasant; his mighty pen transforms itself into the flail of the countryman. There is but a step from the pathetic to the comic, and Luther at times, in his polemical writings, verges upon the comic, so that we are obliged to guard against being infected by the ingenious coarseness of his tone, which exerts an involuntary charm over our risibles. Notwithstanding all this, however, we cannot be angry with Luther, even when *he* gives way to anger. A certain true-heartedness and honesty underlie his very storming and blustering, and we become reconciled to him before our vexation has time to express itself. On serious reflection, however, we may well be conscious of a feeling of sadness that the high and glorious nature of the man contains elements which are so contradictory, and which his ill-wishers can so readily combine into a caricature. We must also express the further regret that Luther's dislike to Zwingle, which in the year 1537 seemed to be weakening, soon returned in full force, so that Luther carried his enmity against the Swiss Reformer and his adherents down to the grave.[1]

[1] In his treatise on the Councils, written in 1539, he made occasion, in speaking of the Nestorians, to class Zwingle among their number. Upon this the Zurichers wrote to him, admonishing him to keep the peace. Luther did not answer their letter, but kept himself quiet for a time. In 1542, however, he published his *Vermahnung zum Gebet wider die Türken*, in which, according to his custom, he classed Zwingle with Münzer and his associates. The Zurichers refrained from noticing this affront, in order that they might not break the peace. In Luther's letters, also, of the fifth decade of his century, we occasionally find the old attacks upon the Sacramentarians; his joy over the Reformation of Cologne was seriously diminished by fear lest the Zwinglian element should there be represented (comp. DE WETTE, vol. v. Nos. 2146 and 2252, where he even calls the mediator, Bucer, "a chatterer," p. 709). In 1543, Froschauer, a bookseller at Zurich, was kind enough to send Luther a copy of the Zurich translation of the Bible. Luther expressed his distaste for such presents in a manner which was not the most polite in the world. He thanked the sender, it is true (31st August, DE WETTE, vol. v. No. 2162), but added that the Church of God could have no fellowship with the preachers of Zurich, who had been sufficiently admonished to renounce their error, etc. He would not, he declared, become a partaker in their condemnation and their blasphemous doctrine, but would pray and teach against them to the end. The judgment which had fallen upon Zwingle would, he predicted, overtake the rest of the preachers. Gualter, Zwingle's son-in-law, thereupon published the writings of

Luther had besought God that he might not live to behold the terrible outbreak of a religious war in Germany. He gave an entertainment to his friends on St. Martin's Day, 1545, on which occasion he expressed himself as follows :—"So long as I live, no danger, please God, will arise, and there will be a continuance of peace in Germany. But when I die, then pray. There will truly be need of prayer; and our children will be obliged to lay hold on their spears, and there will be sad times in Germany. Therefore, I say, 'Be diligent in prayer after my death.'" Only too soon did it become necessary to have recourse to the spear. After every endeavour to preserve peace had been exhausted, and the last religious conference at Regensburg had proved of no avail, the Diet went into session at the same city, in June 1546. But few princes were personally present on this occasion. The Schmalkaldic Allies

Zwingle, together with a defence of his character. In the *Commentary on Genesis*, Luther poured forth fresh invectives. Finally, he wrote his *Kurzes Bekenntniss vom heiligen Sacrament*, in which he expressed regret for his former leniency. The Zurichers now felt constrained to defend themselves, which they did in the *Orthodoxa Tigurinæ ecclesiæ ministrorum confessio*, 1545. In reference to this publication, Luther wrote to James Probst, at Bremen (17th January 1546, DE WETTE, vol. v. No. 2310), that he had been wishing the Zurichers to write against him with violence, in order that their animosity towards him might be made manifest. He even proceeded to parody the first Psalm, as follows: "Blessed is he who walketh not in the counsel of the sectarians, nor standeth in the way of the Zwinglians, nor sitteth in the seat of the Zurichers." He wrote this shortly before his journey to Eisleben. How far, therefore, there is foundation for the story which relates that before this last journey Luther said to Melanchthon, "I confess that there has been too much controversy on the subject of the sacrament," and even represents the Reformer as commissioning Melanchthon to write a conciliatory tractate to the same effect, we will not attempt to decide. The story is certainly supported by good authorities. Even if it be true, however, it would, as Ebrard justly remarks (in *das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl*, p. 483), contain no recantation of doctrine on the part of Luther, but would be simply a confession that he had been too passionate as a polemic. But even this is improbable, since the very last sermons which Luther preached shortly before his death, at Halle and Eisleben, contain severe attacks upon the "desecrators of the sacrament." We can scarcely bring ourselves to assume, with Ebrard, that Luther made use of the expression above cited previous to an earlier journey to Eisleben (in 1539), and that the remark was erroneously referred to his last journey. The fact is, however, that Luther was one of those great men whose utterances cannot be calculated upon with certainty. His moods were not always equal, unyielding though he proved himself when some doctrine which he had once embraced was assailed.

sent their deputies, who laid before the Diet a paper containing a petition for the ratification of peace and a protest against the Council at Trent. This application was scornfully rejected. On account of the scanty attendance at the Diet, nothing was effected, a decision being postponed until the following February. The emperor, meantime, had issued orders for the recruiting of his troops, a process which was going on, accordingly, as early as in June. On being questioned concerning his reasons for such a proceeding, Charles replied that he would be most gracious to the obedient states, but would deal with the disobedient ones in accordance with the law and his imperial authority. The emperor was exceedingly desirous to divest the war of the odious character of a war of religion, and to give it the appearance of an executionary war against the enemies of the empire and of civil order. He sent letters to this effect to the cities of Strassburg, Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Ulm, and to Duke Ulric of Wurtemberg. The Elector of Saxony instructed his envoy to leave the Diet secretly; he commended the issue of the affair to God, who, he said, would doubtless order His own cause to the promotion of His glory. Landgrave Philip wrote to the elector that he had long foreseen the present turn of events, and expressed his chagrin that the Protestants should have waited and slept too long. The two leaders of the Alliance made trial of one more final measure, however. From Ichterhausen, under date 4th July, they despatched a letter to the emperor, assuring him that they were unconscious of any act of disobedience towards him, and claiming their right to be heard before violent measures were resorted to against them. The emperor replied by pronouncing sentence of outlawry upon the leaders of the Alliance (20th July). In this particular, also, Charles avoided all reference to religion. It was entirely otherwise with the pope. *He* was anxious to have the war prosecuted as a religious war.[1] He made pro-

[1] Besides Sleidan, the chief source of information concerning this war is still HORTLEDER (died 1640), *Von den Ursachen des deutschen Kriegs Karls V.*

'clamation thereof in the old style, as a crusade against heretics, and of course promised copious indulgences to all who would take part in it. In imitation of Luther's forcible language, the Protestants called this bull "the dragon venom of the Roman Antichrist." Nicholas Amsdorf published it with an introduction.[1] At about the same time the pope addressed a brief to the Swiss, encouraging them to take part in this meritorious war. Among all the excellent deeds of the Confederates, this, he declared, would be the most excellent.

The Protestants now collected their forces. The upland cities assembled under their general, Sebastian Schärtlin of Burtenbach, an old soldier, who had served under Maximilian II. and had been present at the capture of Rome. As heads of the Schmalkaldic Alliance, the Elector John Frederick of Saxony, and Landgrave Philip of Hesse, assumed the command of the Protestant forces. The troops of the Alliance amounted to 18,000 infantry soldiers and 9000 cavalry, and the army of the Uplanders was still more numerous. The sum total of the combined forces is estimated at 47,000.[2] The imperial army was at first far smaller, being composed of 3000 Spaniards, 5000 German foot soldiers, and 700 horsemen. The Papal auxiliaries had not then arrived, and the emperor, after vainly waiting for them at Regensburg, retired to his secure quarters at Landshut. Had the leaders of the Alliance been united at this time, they would to all human appearance have won the victory. Schärtlin had occupied the defile in the Tyrol through which the Italian auxiliaries were obliged to pass in order to join the emperor, and also purposed a visit to the dignitaries assembled at Trent; he, however, found himself restricted in his operations by the council of war at Ulm, without whose sanction it was forbidden to pro-

wider die Schmalkaldischen Bundesobersten, etc. Comp. JAHN, *Geschichte des Schmalkaldischen Krieges*, Leipsic, 1837; also MARHEINEKE (iv.), and RANKE (iv. and v.).

[1] *Bulla des grossen Ablasses, welche Paul III. zu diesem Zug und Ausreutung der Lutherischen Ketzerei gegeben hat.*

[2] MARHEINEKE, iv. p. 421.

ceed. Between Schärtlin and the landgrave the demon of jealousy was rampant. Schärtlin accused Philip of not wishing to bite the fox, declaring that every ditch seemed too deep and every morass too wide for the landgrave to cross. Philip had quarrelled with the elector also. And thus in mutual displeasure, which paralyzed effort, the Protestants gave the emperor ample time to receive the hoped-for reinforcements. Under Ottavio Farnese, a nephew of the pope, an army of 12,900 Italians marched to the support of Charles, being further augmented in its passage by a considerable number of German lanzknechts. Of this body Duke Alba had command. The hostile armies were stationed opposite each other in the vicinity of Ingolstadt; but before any engagement took place, the allied troops found it necessary to retire, as even their pecuniary supplies were exhausted.

Affairs now took an unexpected turn.

Duke Maurice of Saxony, son-in-law to the landgrave, had succeeded his father Henry in the government of the dukedom. Maurice was a Protestant, but not a member of the Schmalkaldic Alliance, nor was he favourably disposed towards his cousin, the Elector John Frederick. Prior to the time of which we speak, he had waged a petty war against him with reference to the town of Wurzen,[1] and he had now entered the emperor's service, after concluding a treaty with Charles, according to the conditions of which he was to assist in the war against the members of the League, while still retaining his own religious liberty. He had also promised to submit himself to the decrees of the council in like manner with other princes, and to introduce no innovations in religious matters. He now regarded himself as commissioned by the emperor to execute the sentence of outlawry pronounced upon the elector, and accordingly invaded the dominions of the latter, under the pretext that it would be better for the elector to fall into his hands than into those of King Ferdi-

[1] This war, on account of its taking place at the Easter season, at the time of the Easter cakes, was called the Pancake War [*Fladen krieg*].

nand, who was ready to march into Saxony from Bohemia. When the elector received the alarming intelligence of the invasion of his land, he abandoned everything else for the purpose of protecting his own possessions, which, with the exception of the three strong cities of Wittenberg, Gotha, and Eisenach, were already in Maurice's power. As soon, however, as the elector appeared, all his people flocked around him, and he found it easy to recapture all that Maurice had seized. He even entered the domains of his opponent, and left him only the cities of Dresden and Leipsic. But at this juncture the emperor advanced into Saxony from the direction of Bohemia. The elector, who would scarcely credit the report of this sudden appearance of Charles, retired to the city of Mühlberg, on the Elbe, believing himself to be fully protected by the river. The Spaniards, however, paid no regard to the rolling waters, but, holding their sabres between their teeth, plunged into the flood and swam across. The rest of the army, not caring to emulate the intrepidity of the Spanish soldiers, was conducted by a young peasant to shallow places in the Elbe, where the river was easily fordable. A battle was then forced upon the elector on the heath of Lochau. His people fought heroically, but were obliged, nevertheless, to succumb to the military art of Alba. Long after the elector had seen his cavalry put to flight, and the lines of the infantry everywhere broken, he continued his personal resistance, but at length surrendered himself as a prisoner of war on the 24th of April 1547. When led away to be presented to the emperor, he exclaimed, "Lord God, have mercy on me; here I am!"

Soon after the capture of the elector, the emperor appeared before Wittenberg, which city still continued its valiant defence, having been in a state of siege since October 1546. In the spirit of Luther, Bugenhagen there encouraged the people in prayer and stedfastness.[1] Over the fresh grave of

[1] Bugenhagen himself described these days of tribulation in his book, entitled, *Wie es uns zu Wittenberg in der Stadt gegangen ist in diesem vergangenen*

the departed Reformer, the citizens sang, with a heartiness that they had never known before, *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott.* The faithful shepherd of this smitten flock himself needed the support of prayer for his own heart's strengthening. As he himself relates, he was repeatedly tempted by the devil to leave the city, which he had sufficient opportunities of doing; but faith ever prevailed over the temptation offered to the flesh. It was the same with the other preachers; one was strengthened by the courage of another. A similar spirit was exhibited by the schoolmasters, one of whom, on being asked whether he and his comrades were willing to remain in the city, answered for himself and for all: "Ay, and though we should die for it, we will gladly remain by the grave of our dear father, Doctor Martin Luther." Bugenhagen sent away his wife and children when the tidings of the emperor's arrival were received, and for six weeks he knew nothing of them. He prayed to God during this time as follows: "My wife and children are gone, my house and property are no longer in my possession, I myself am in the jaws of death; this poor city and church are in danger; our school" [University] "is in disorder; my dear brethren and friends in this land have been spoiled by fire, robbery, and murder; our beloved prince and master is in captivity, and has lost his territories and his subjects. 'The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away,' as Job said. Dear Father, let me add, 'And the Lord will restore all things.' Let me live, that after Thy wrath I may hear of and behold Thy goodness on the earth, that this city and church may be glad again; that the University, the churches, and the schools, together with this ruined land, may be lifted up again; that our children and posterity may once more cleave to the precious gospel; that the word of our salvation may

Krieg bis wir durch Gottes Gnade erlöset sind und unsere hohe Schule durch den durchlauchtigsten Fürsten und Herrn, Herrn Moritzen, Herzogen zu Sachsen, u. s. w. wiederum aufgerichtet ist. Wahrhaftige Historie beschrieben durch Joh. Bugenhagen, Pommern, Doctor und Pfarherr zu Wittenberg. Geschrieben zu Wittenberg, 1547, den 8 August; gedruckt daselbst durch Veit Kreutzer. 40.

have free course in the world. Then will I sing the *Nunc dimittis;* then do Thou graciously take me away from this vale of misery, or, if it be Thy will to prolong my life, Thou wilt surely give me our daily bread. Should there be no room for me at Bethlehem in the inn, Thou wilt provide room enough for me in the stable and the manger, and wilt give me, in addition, peace and a thankful heart." On the Tuesday succeeding the Feast of St. Martin [11th November] 1546, the suburbs of Wittenberg were burned down. When, on the following morning, a gentle rain fell on the very spot where the fire had raged, and a rainbow appeared, Bugenhagen descried in the occurrence an omen of peace, and embodied the idea in an edifying discourse.

On Ascension Day, in the year 1547, the elector finally found himself compelled to surrender the city to the emperor. The burghers entreated Bugenhagen to write to their lord and dissuade him from so doing, but Bugenhagen declined the commission, and assembled the people for prayer. The following formed a part of the petition offered by him on this occasion:—

"Not knowing what to do in our distress, this alone remains to us, dear heavenly Father, to lift up our eyes unto Thee in heaven. All things on which men rely we have had in abundance, but we have been corrupted by these things, and in order that we should have no creature or work of man to put our trust in, Thou hast taken from us even our dear master the elector. We thank Thee, dear Father, that with this fatherly[1] chastisement Thou hast driven us to commit ourselves to Thy mercy in Christ Jesus, as in the first commandment Thou requirest us to do. Thus, dear Father, Thou hast what Thou desirest of us. Deal graciously therefore with Thy poor children, and be present in Thy Holy Spirit with our elector and with us, and give us good counsel, that we may be delivered." At this point the people fell upon their knees and prayed so fervently, that all were convinced that

[1] The above, and not "natural," is probably the true reading.

the matter could not result disastrously after having been committed thus to the hand of God.[1]

The elector now himself advised the burghers to surrender the city. He could not, indeed, do otherwise, for the emperor had threatened him with death if he refused to surrender Wittenberg. In fact, the sentence of death had already been pronounced against him, though possibly this was merely a feint, employed for the purpose of alarming him. The elector received the intelligence of his doom as he was playing a game of chess with Duke Ernest of Brunswick. "I cannot believe," he exclaimed, "that the emperor means to treat me thus. If such, however, be the determination of his imperial majesty, I desire to be assured of the fact, in order that I may leave directions concerning my wife and my children." At the entreaty of Joachim, elector of Brandenburg, the life of the Elector of Saxony was spared; but by the articles of capitulation to which he agreed, he was obliged to renounce the government of his domains, and to remain the prisoner of the emperor as long as the latter desired. Maurice received the territories of his cousin, only a few cities being left to their old master.

The tidings of the elector's captivity had a most depressing effect upon the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. This prince relied upon the intercessory offices of his son-in-law Maurice and the Elector of Brandenburg, but the emperor insisted that Philip should surrender at discretion. The landgrave accordingly presented himself before the emperor at Halle. It had been designed that the scene which we are now about to describe should be one of great solemnity. Beneath a gilded canopy, in a splendidly decorated hall, his imperial majesty was seated, surrounded by the highest of the nobility and clergy. The landgrave was required to assume a kneeling posture before the throne, while his chancellor, standing by his side, read the humble apology of Philip. After the accomplishment of this ceremony in due form, Held, the

[1] See Vogt's *Johann Bugenhagen*, pp. 421 sqq.

chancellor of Charles, conferred the imperial absolution. Various articles were next presented to the landgrave, for his signature. In religious matters he was required to submit to the decrees of the council; to this, however, the landgrave assented only on condition that the council referred to should be a general, free, Christian council. The emperor, on the other hand, promised Philip to inflict neither corporal punishment nor *perpetual* imprisonment upon him.[1] Before the landgrave was aware, however, he was taken prisoner at the hotel of Duke Alba, whither he had been invited to an entertainment, and, as we shall see, a considerable time elapsed before he was released.

The Schmalkaldic League was now annihilated, and with its destruction the purposes of the emperor were for once accomplished. In honour of the victory thus gained, Charles caused some medals to be struck off, bearing the image of a parted rope and the fall of the Titans from heaven to earth. Abject apologies were offered by almost all the members of the league in Upper Germany, and fines were paid by them. It is painful to see how one Swabian city after another—Bopfingen, Nördlingen, Dinkelsbühl, and all the rest of them—crawled to the victor's feet and concluded a separate peace with the emperor, acting upon the principle that "every fox must look out for his own brush."

Bitter, as was to be expected, was the fate of the Elector Hermann of Cologne. He was degraded from his office. The

[1] Up to our own time it has been maintained that the original text of the imperial covenant read "any" imprisonment [*einig* instead of *ewig*]. It is asserted that the emperor's promise was thus communicated to the landgrave, that the word *einig* was afterwards altered into *ewig*, and that in this manner Philip was imposed upon by a gross falsification. Since the recent discovery of documents in which *ewig* appears as the original text, this suspicion must undoubtedly be abandoned. The emperor's conduct was perfidious, nevertheless; for what, after all, is the meaning of *perpetual* imprisonment? The landgrave's imprisonment must soon have appeared *perpetual* to him, for he was dragged from one captivity to another. This "vindication" of Charles' "honour" is, therefore, a very precarious one. See HELLER'S presentation of the document above mentioned in the *Münchner politische Blätter, Bd.* 58, *Heft* ii., 1866.

states and subjects of the archbishopric were, in the name of the emperor, released from their allegiance to him, and commanded thenceforth to recognise Count Adolph of Schaumburg as their spiritual pastor-in-chief. Great was the joy of the fanatical clergy of Cologne at the execution of this sentence. The degraded elector retired to his family estates.

Let us turn once more to Wittenberg. The emperor had promised that no foreigners, but only Germans, should compose the garrison stationed there. (The people of the city had chiefly feared the incoming of the Spaniards.) Charles kept his word. He also manifested great forbearance in all things pertaining to religion. He inspected the churches, and desired that the preaching should go on as usual while he was present. In Whitsun week Bugenhagen preached daily on the history of the festival, and fearlessly discussed the distinction between the faith of the Evangelicals and that of the pope. The emperor is said to have declared that he found things in these lands very different from the representations which had been made to him. We are all familiar with the anecdote which relates that, when on a visit to the castle church, the emperor being advised by Alba to have the bones of the arch-heretic Luther disinterred and burned, Charles replied that he waged war with the living, and not with the dead. The imperial troops remained in the city for a fortnight. After their departure, Maurice took formal possession of Wittenberg, and received the homage of the council and the rest of the inhabitants, assuring to them their ancient privileges and rights. The Wittenbergers generally, not excepting Bugenhagen, soon became reconciled to the change in the government. A certain number of faithful ones, who were still unwilling to abandon their old sovereign, were much displeased with Bugenhagen for acquiescing in the rule of Maurice, and accused him of hypocrisy towards the emperor and of ingratitude to the captive elector. From this time forth it was no longer John Frederick, but Maurice, for whom the clergy were required to offer public prayer as the ruler of the land.

Notwithstanding this, however, secret petitions, and even public prayers in the churches, for the former elector's speedy release from captivity, ceased not to ascend. On the 16th of July 1547, Maurice summoned the Wittenberg theologians to Leipsic, and assured them of his favourable intentions toward the University, declaring it to be his desire not to "diminish but to increase" its prosperity, and exhorting them to continue to proclaim the pure doctrines of the gospel. Hence they might be convinced that Maurice, though a political opponent of the Schmalkaldic League, was yet no apostate from the faith of the Protestants, as many accused him of being.

In the meantime, the pope exerted every effort to counteract the emperor's endeavours to secure peace. Under the pretext that the plague had broken out at Trent, he transferred the council to Bologna, for which place a few fathers took their departure in March 1547. The emperor, however, would hear nothing of a removal of the council, and even threatened to have the pope's legate thrown into the Etsch if he ventured to say anything more on the subject. He also declared null and void beforehand all which this Papal council should decree. With him sided the German bishops, while the Protestants could discern neither in Trent nor in Bologna a council in which they could place any confidence.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE ARMED DIET OF AUGSBURG—THE SECOND INTERIM—JOHN AGRICOLA, JOHN BRENZ, AND THE SWABIAN PREACHERS—POPE JULIUS III. AND THE SYNOD OF TRENT—MAURICE AND THE THIRD INTERIM (OF LEIPSIC)—FALSE POSITION OF MELANCHTHON—FLACIUS AND THE ADIAPHORISTIC CONTROVERSY — ANOTHER DIET AT AUGSBURG — SIEGE OF MAGDEBURG—SHAMEFUL TREATMENT OF THE LANDGRAVE—INTERVENTION OF MAURICE—TREATY OF PASSAU—DEATH OF MAURICE—RELIGIOUS PEACE OF AUGSBURG—DEATH OF CHARLES V.

THE League of Schmalkalden was annihilated, but Protestantism as a conviction continued to subsist in the hearts of its friends; and though much that had already been gained for the cause was now lost, the confidence of the Evangelicals in the ultimate victory of truth remained unchanged. We have just seen that in the very midst of the hardships of war, the courage of believers waxed stronger. As for the emperor, he appeared to have no thought of subjugating the consciences of his subjects, or waging a war of religion against those whose belief differed from his own. If he ever manifested tolerance towards those of a different faith, it was at the time of which we speak, and he still cherished the idea that he would be able to bring about a final agreement on religious questions. To this his constant purpose he trusted that the "armed" Diet at Augsburg, held in July, 1547, would be subservient. The epithet "armed" was applied to this Diet because the emperor had stationed his troops in the vicinity. Within the assembly, however, armour

was laid aside, the topics there discussed being of a spiritual nature relating chiefly to the sacred matter of conviction. Whether or not the emperor was in earnest (Calvin always called him "the fox"), he at least took great pains to foster the belief that his war against the members of the Schmalkaldic League had had nothing to do with *religion*. And, indeed, immediately after his victory, vigorous as were his proceedings against the insurgent heads of the league, he treated the Protestants *as such* with leniency, giving them liberty in the matter of divine worship, and thereby exciting their amazement. Another effort to arrive at an understanding in regard to matters of faith was now in contemplation. The emperor, being at the helm on this occasion, chose as peace mediators men of whom he entertained the hope that they would avoid extremes, so far as that was practicable, and find a just medium between the two channels of belief. Of those deeper needs of faith which will not suffer themselves to be abrogated by a diplomatic pen-stroke, he had, indeed, no conception. He had honoured with his confidence three learned men, two of whom belonged to the Romish, and one to the Evangelical party. The former two were Julius von Pflug, the same who had at one time been ousted from the bishopric of Naumburg, but who was now reinstated in that see, and Michael Helding, suffragan-bishop of Mentz and bishop (*in partibus*) of Sidon, hence called Sidonius; the Protestant was John Agricola of Eisleben, at the period of which we speak court preacher to the Elector of Brandenburg. Luther called this man "Master Grickel." All that we know of him points to the conclusion that he was a man of talent and a gifted preacher, not destitute of dogmatic obstinacy, which he evinced by seeking to out-Luther Luther in reference to the doctrine of law. In the present discussion, however, he manifested so much pliancy and submission to the will of the emperor as to occasion a mistaken estimate of his character on the part of many. These three men prepared an ecclesiastical constitution, which was legalized by the

emperor on the 15th of May 1548, and which, on account of its provisory character, was entitled an "Interim." To distinguish it from the Regensburg Interim (of 1541), it was called the *Augsburg* or *Second* Interim. It consisted of twenty-six articles. The doctrine of justification by faith, which Luther had guarded as the apple of his eye, was here diluted to the least possible degree; the doctrine of the church was cast in as Catholic a mould as possible (the interpretation of Scripture being made dependent upon its authority); the primacy of Peter, and consequently of the pope, was recognised (conditioned, it is true, upon the truly Christian character of the individual pope); the doctrine of the *seven* sacraments was restored; and the intercession of saints, and even the sacrifice of the mass, with all its dependencies, together with extreme unction, were established in this interim. What, then, remained to the Protestants? The provisional allowance of the marriage of priests until the council should render its decision in the matter, and the privilege of partaking of the Lord's Supper in both kinds—the doctrine of concomitancy being here maintained. Truly, Master Grickel uttered an empty boast when he declared that he had "opened a great wide window to the gospel; he had reformed the pope, converted the emperor and made a Lutheran of him, and now the golden age would come, when the gospel should be preached in every bishop's land and throughout all Europe." And how grossly did he deceive himself when he affirmed that Luther would have lived ten years longer from joy at such a victory.[1]

After the reading of the interim before the Diet, the Elector (Archbishop) of Mentz arose and thanked the emperor for it in the name of the other states, although he had received no commission empowering him thus to act. On the contrary, much dissatisfaction was manifested on both sides. Margrave John of Brandenburg and the Count-Palatine Wolfgang von Zweibrücken immediately declared themselves opposed to the

[1] SOUCHAY, *l.c.* p. 451.

interim. Maurice was also displeased with it, and withdrew from the Diet after he had communicated his objections to the emperor. John Frederick, in his captivity, protested against the interim, and ceased not his protestations though they increased the rigour of his imprisonment. He was deprived of his only comfort, the Holy Scriptures and the religious books with which he refreshed himself. Still he remained stedfast. The books, he said, might be taken away from him, but no one could tear from his heart what he had received therein from the Holy Scriptures. More pliancy was shown—at certain moments, at least—by Landgrave Philip, who wrote to his son that to hear mass was, after all, better than to play cards, or to sacrifice to Bacchus or Venus, and that ceremonies were, in any case, not so very important.[1]

The interim met with no kindly reception from the Hessian *preachers*, however. The imperial cities of Germany likewise declared themselves opposed to the same. When Granvella intimated to the deputies from Strassburg that there existed means of reducing disobedient states to obedience, they replied that it was possible to burn a man to death, but that no one could be forced into believing at the dictation of another. The North German cities of Lubeck, Hamburg, Bremen, Lüneburg, and Magdeburg also stedfastly opposed the interim. Duke Ulric of Wurtemberg and the Elector of the Palatinate submitted. Not so the theologians of Wurtemberg. Brenz resisted manfully at Halle. On the arrival of the victorious emperor at Halle in December of the year 1546, the papers of this Evangelical minister had fallen into the hands of the imperial party, and Brenz had been obliged to take refuge in flight. At first he retreated to a lofty tower of the city, and afterwards, when no longer secure in that hiding-place, he concealed himself in the fields and woods in the bitter cold of winter. He was finally recalled by the council, but only to be exposed to fresh

[1] A communication to the same purport, which he is said to have addressed to the emperor, has been declared a forgery.

persecutions when the interim demanded a decision. Brenz formed his decision. He called the interim the *Interitus* (downfall), and declared that the emperor had been most outrageously deceived. To assent to the interim, he averred, would be to serve two masters of contrary minds. These plain-spoken declarations were, however, not unobserved. Granvella demanded that the bold preacher should be delivered over to justice, and attempts were made to arrest him, but, warned in time, he fled to Basel,[1] where he was kindly received by Grynæus. In the meantime, his family was exiled, and a price was set on his own head. At Basel the sorely-tried man was apprised of the death of his wife. After undergoing a variety of fortunes,[2] he was called, subsequent to the abolition of the interim, to Stuttgart, in the spring of 1553, and there contributed not a little to the establishment of the ecclesiastical constitution. He remained in the last-mentioned city until his death, which occurred on the 11th of September 1570.

Erhard Schnepff also, professor at Tübingen, was ousted from his position in consequence of the interim. On the 11th of November 1548, after the mass had been re-established in Tübingen, he preached his farewell sermon, which drew tears from many of his auditors. Fifty-one other persons who held office in the city and its vicinity, having refused their assent to the interim, were discharged on the same day.[3] The entire number of clergymen in Upper Germany who were

[1] A note received by him from some friend in the council chamber contained the following words:—*Fuge, Brenti, cito, citius, citissime.* Concerning his reception at Basel and the somewhat frugal hospitality extended to him on the part of the University, see GAST'S *Tagebuch*, p. 79. The city of Basel had no desire to incur the ill-will of the emperor, and therefore forbade the printing of any attack upon the interim.

[2] He lived for a time under an assumed name in the Castle of Hornburg, in the Black Forest, and afterwards removed to Urach and, later, to Sindelfingen. Amid the perturbations of the life which he now led, he married a second time. In connection with ten theologians of Wurtemberg, he subsequently published the *Confessio Würtembergica*, which was approved by Melanchthon and the Saxon theologians generally. See HARTMANN, *l.c.*

[3] HARTMANN, *Erhard Schnepff*, Tübingen, 1870, p. 68.

dismissed from their charges on account of the interim is estimated to have been four hundred. Some of the clergy thus displaced experienced brutal usage. Martin Frecht, of Ulm, and a number of other preachers who refused to submit to the interim, "were placed in irons by the provost, and thus miserably conducted to Speier."[1] Opposition was encountered in the Rhenish provinces likewise. A preacher residing in that part of the empire, who had been driven by fear of man to assent to the interim, afterwards experienced such remorse for the act that he committed suicide in despair.[2]

But the interim excited opposition not only on the side of the Protestants, but also from the Catholic party. Few as were the concessions made to the Protestants in the instrument to which we refer, they still were concessions in which Ultramontanism could not acquiesce. Cardinal Sfondrati, to whom the emperor had caused a copy of the document to be sent, protested especially against the contemplated allowance of the marriage of priests. It struck him as an unheard-of thing that a consecrated priest should be the husband of any woman. Nor was he more willing to concede the cup to the laity. He considered that his imperial majesty had been guilty of unwarrantable presumption in offering an independent decision concerning ecclesiastical matters. Even the Archbishop of Mentz, who had so prematurely returned thanks to the emperor in the name of the states, was now among the opponents of the interim. Cardinal Farnese, at Rome, discovered six or eight heresies in the imperial instrument, and regarded the issue thereof as an encroachment upon the rights of the pope. It was satirized by the popular wit in stanzas like the following :—

"Hut' dich vor dem Interim,
Es lauert ein Schalk hinter ihm." [3]

[1] Thus Melanchthon informs King Christian of Denmark, September 1548 (*Corp. Ref.* vii. p. 131. Comp. also some of the following letters).

[2] *Corp. Ref.* p. 164.

[3] [Of the interim beware,
For a knave's in ambush there.]

And some learned investigator discovered that, by a transposition of the letters composing the word, *interim* might be converted into *mentiri* (to lie). Satirical medals (interim dollars) were likewise struck off.

In the midst of these disturbances, Maurice, through the summer and part of the winter of 1548, held several diets and conventions, which were attended by his theologians. These assemblies met at Meissen, Pegau, Torgau, Zelle, Jüterbogk, and finally, toward the close of the year, at Leipsic. In the latter city, before the termination of the year, he ordered the composition of a formula, which, to distinguish it from the interims of Regensburg and Augsburg, is called the *Leipsic* Interim, and also the *New* or *Third* Interim. This treated less of the tenets of faith than of the usages of divine worship, in reference to which latter a return to many of the ancient practices was recommended. For our comfort be it observed, that the practices which were to be resumed had no bearing upon faith, but were simply indifferent things (*Adiaphora*)—such, for instance, as the use of the cope, of lights upon the altar, and similar liturgical additions. It was also ordered that Friday and Saturday should again be observed as fast-days, this fasting being recommended not as a meritorious work, or a part of the service of God, but "as a secular institution and regulation." These external matters were, however, not the only ones concerned. In the dogmatical teachings of the interim—in the doctrine of justification, for example—there was manifested an ill-concealed accommodation to the Catholic apprehension; and in this, as in the Augsburg Interim, the rites of confirmation and extreme unction were admitted to the dignity of sacraments. With Paul Eber, John Bugenhagen, George Major, and John Pfeffinger, Philip Melanchthon was associated in the preparation of this interim —the man upon whom, after the death of Luther, the task of representing the cause of the latter seemed chiefly to devolve. Can it be wondered at that many regarded this pliancy of Melanchthon's as more than weakness—that they beheld in it

a betrayal of the sacred cause? An action that might be comprehended and pardoned in an Agricola, could not be allowed to pass uncensured when performed by the Teacher of Germany. As long as Luther lived, Melanchthon, though often with inward repugnance, had yielded to his superior force of will,[1] and had kept silence while Luther stormed and raved; but Luther in return had had patience with the weaknesses of Melanchthon, and had protected his friend as much as possible from the attacks of others. The recollection of the friendly relation which subsisted between the two Reformers adds to the pain of contemplating the reckless onslaught which the irritable race of Luther's followers now made upon Melanchthon, discharging its resentment upon him in a manner not the most gentle in the world. Putting out of consideration the rudeness and lack of polish perceptible in the language in which these zealots strove to make reparation to their departed leader, we can readily understand the indignation which became more and more vehement in the opponents of Melanchthon at each fresh manifestation of pliancy and timidity on the part of the latter. Ere now he had been compelled to listen to bitter reproaches from some of the noblest representatives of the Reformation, and in secret, we doubt not, had been forced to acknowledge their justice. At the present juncture he encountered the reproaches of Brenz, who had preferred proscription to a false peace, and who now wrote to him from the place of his exile. Nor did Calvin, with whom he had recently contracted a bond of friendship, conceal his displeasure on this occasion. It must, however, have been doubly painful to Melanchthon when former *pupils* of his, who had looked up to him as their master, and in whom he had taken a fatherly interest, threw down the gauntlet to him. Prominent among a number who thus

[1] In April 1548 he wrote to Carlowitz: "I was formerly compelled to cringe ignominiously to Luther, like a slave, on occasions when he gave way to his stubborn self-will, a quality of which he possessed no small share, instead of considering his own personal dignity or the common weal" (*Corp. Ref.* vi. p. 880).

acted was Matthias Flacius (Flacich) of Illyria, a young man of an ardent and impetuous temper, but at the same time a sound scholar and thoroughly decided in his convictions. Through the mediation of Melanchthon, he had formerly held the position of teacher of Hebrew at Wittenberg, but had since 1540 been preaching at Magdeburg. To the latter city those who were dissatisfied with the interim retired, as "to the court of appeal of God and Christ;" and thence proceeded the most violent attacks upon the instrument and its composers. Flacius called the Saxon theologians Achabites, Baalites, Epicureans, lovers of the Babylonish harlot, corrupters of religion, secret Papists, etc. But the fatal dilemma in which good Melanchthon was placed can be comprehended only when we consider that on his slightest resistance to a false mediation, he was accused by the imperial party of obstinacy, of being an "alarmist," and even of sedition.[1] How was it possible for him to suit all, with the best will in the world, lacking as he was in that energy and boldness which Luther possessed, and which could force their way through a thousand obstructing scruples! But to evade the difficulties which beset his path, to withdraw his head from the noose, as a coward would have done, Melanchthon was far too great and too noble. With what joy another in his position would have hailed the invitation to England received by Melanchthon in the summer of 1548! Philip, however, declined the call, being unwilling to leave Germany at so fateful a crisis. Truly, the man who unflinchingly endures a cross fire, manifests as much courage as he who with the sword cuts his way through opposing ranks.[2] Melanchthon met the attacks

[1] In August 1548 the emperor complained to Maurice that "Philip *firmly persisted* in his evil and venomous temper, and everywhere opposed the (Augsburg) Interim" (*Corp. Ref.* vii. p. 127).

[2] The latest biographer of Melanchthon, C. SCHMIDT (p. 501), very beautifully remarks that "there is something tragic in Melanchthon's acknowledgment of his own helplessness at a moment when the heroic virtues of Luther seemed so necessary to him . . . it is a painful spectacle, and it would be still more painful if we did not know that this noble spirit did not set in final obscurity, and that what he did was the result of error, and not of unfaithfulness."

of his assailants with the trust that God would preserve the remnant of His Church despite all political revolutions. In regard to the violent publication of Flacius, he wrote as follows to a friend:[1]—"So far as I am personally concerned, I bear with equanimity the blow that I receive from our neighbours (of Madgeburg), for, as Ulysses says, I am accustomed to thrusts and cuts; I am grieved only on account of our churches, which are slandered by false accusations, and in which a new seed of discord is being sown." Who can blame Melanchthon, vilified as he had been, for feeling pained at the conduct of the "Slavic fugitive," who had received numerous benefits from the University of Wittenberg and from Melanchthon personally, or for declaring that he had "nourished a viper in his bosom" in extending kindness to Flacius? He would not have been human if he had not been deeply moved by the behaviour of his former pupil. And yet he prevailed upon himself to write in all gentleness to the young Hotspur,[2] who, however, answered him roughly and arrogantly.

[1] George Fabricius, *Corp. Ref.* p. 449.

[2] "I will make no attack upon you," Melanchthon wrote, among other things; "let us bear our grief in peace, and seek you not to enkindle a fresh grief, more violent than the old. *It is possible for men to entertain different opinions in regard to the cope without forgetting, in their difference, the commandment of love.* Let us rather strive, with united strength, to defend necessary doctrine; conflict in abundance is threatening from without, therefore it would be better for the Church if we two were to exercise a mutual forbearance. My consolation is, that the Lord will protect His Church, that He will abide with her to the end of the world, and that in this land the gospel is purely preached, all articles of faith are held without adulteration, and the sacraments are duly administered" (SCHMIDT, *l.c.* p. 522; comp. *Corp. Ref.* vii. p. 477). It has been justly remarked that, long before the so-called Adiaphoristic controversy, Luther expressed a similar opinion concerning liturgical matters. When in 1539 Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, in introducing the Reformation in his dominions, desired to retain several Catholic usages, Luther wrote to Buchholzer, one of the composers of the new ecclesiastical constitution, as follows:—"If your master will permit you to preach the gospel of Christ in simplicity, clearness, and purity, without any human addition, and to administer the two sacraments of Baptism and the Blood of Jesus Christ according to His institution, and will order the invocation of the saints, as helpers, mediators, and intercessors, to be abandoned, and will forbid the bearing of the sacrament about in procession, and will put a stop to the daily

There are everywhere sordid souls who can discover none but base motives for the weaknesses of great men, and in the case of Melanchthon there were not lacking some who declared that he had been the recipient of a bribe, thereby assailing the honour of the wounded man in the most sensitive quarter. But Melanchthon could easily disregard such suspicions. His tender conscience disquieted him with reproaches of a nobler sort. In view of all this, it was the more soothing to him to receive words of encouragement again, such as were addressed to him by Martin Bucer, and especially by Landgrave Philip, who, a few years later (June 1555), cheered him with the following lines: [1]—"Dear Philip,—There are people whose delight it is to asperse your name; we regard them not, however, being assured that you well know how to act at all times in a manner justifiable before God and profitable to the Christian Church. . . . Many things are done by godly and wise men which are contemned by the world and by gross-minded men, who obstinately persist in their own opinions without assigning any reasons therefor; but God knoweth the hearts. Moreover, sensible and pious men well understand that there are matters in which we should act as occasion requires, provided we transgress not the command of God.

masses for the dead, and forbid the consecration of water, salt, and herbs, and will have pure responsories and songs sung, in Latin and German, in the procession, then, in God's name, join in the procession, and wear a cross of silver or of gold, and a hood or cope of velvet, silk, or linen. And if your master, the elector, be not satisfied with *one* hood or cope, then put on three, as Aaron the high priest put on three coats, one above another, all of them glorious and beautiful. And if his electoral grace be not content with your going about and making a noise and singing *one circuitus* or procession, then go around seven times, as Joshua, together with the children of Israel, marched around Jericho, blowing with trumpets and shouting. And if your master so desire, he may go before you, leaping and dancing, with harps, timbrels, cymbals, and bells, as David did before the ark of the Lord. I am content. For such things, if they be not abused, neither add anything to nor take anything from the gospel; provided only that they be not accounted necessary to salvation, and that men's consciences be not bound thereby. *And if I could agree with the pope and the Papists on such terms as these, how would I thank God and be joyful!*" Thus Luther (DE WETTE, v. No. 1903).

[1] *Corp. Ref.* viii. p. 495; also ROMMEL, vol. iii. p. 304; and SCHMIDT, p. 529.

May God long preserve you in health, for the benefit of the community and of His Church."

We will now return to a consideration of the further course of history.

In November 1549 Paul III. died, being succeeded in February 1550 by Julius III. (John Maria Giocci). This man had been active, as Papal legate, in the Council of Trent; but after his elevation to the pontificate, he manifested more care for worldly enjoyment than for the Church, the conduct of which he in great measure relinquished to Cardinal Crescentio.

The new pontiff immediately placed himself on good terms with the emperor, and in November 1550 he appointed the council, whose sessions had meantime been interrupted, to be resumed at Trent on the 1st of May 1551. The proclamation was worded in the ancient style of the Roman court, the pope being denominated the first vicar of Christ, and heresy being condemned beforehand. Only the *spiritual* princes of the empire were convoked at this time. The emperor was not pleased with the proclamation, and intimated to the pope his opinion that it was necessary to allure heretics with gentleness, just as it is requisite to conceal from wild beasts the net in which it is proposed to capture them. The pope, however, made answer to the emperor that it was far from being his intention to entice the heretics and afterwards contend with them as prisoners;[1] he thought it better to leave open to them a way to escape. The emperor, on the other hand, endeavoured to appease the Protestants in view of the harsh tone of the convocation bull; he advised them not to let the severity of that instrument deter them from attending the council, and offered them safe-conduct and a satisfactory hearing.[2] In the meantime another Diet was held at Augsburg in July 1550. But few princes made their appearance

[1] [Literally, "scuffle with a captured cat."]

[2] This, truly, was little in accordance with an imperial edict, issued from Brussels and addressed to the civil functionaries, commanding the latter to aid the inquisitors in the Netherlands in their proceedings against Protestants.

on this occasion. Even Maurice absented himself. He commissioned his delegate to inform the emperor that it would be impossible for him to have anything to do with the council, if that body did not commence its deliberations afresh, if a casting vote were not conceded to the Evangelical theologians, and if the pope himself were not subordinated to the council. The emperor inquired of the states as to why they had not yet introduced the interim, to which the delegates replied that efforts had been made to introduce it, but that the Evangelical religion having once taken root in the hearts of the masses, was not so quickly to be dislodged; it would be necessary to accustom the people to the interim by degrees. The Elector of Brandenburg, Joachim II., whose son had become Archbishop of Magdeburg, and who was soliciting the Papal confirmation of this appointment, expressed his willingness to send delegates to the council. In the beginning of the year 1552 that assembly was also visited by delegates from the Electorate of Hesse (Melanchthon among the number), and from Wurtemberg, bearing with them the Confessions of their respective states;[1] private conferences were accorded them, but without avail.

The solution of the difficulty came from another quarter. We have seen that Maurice had begun to assume towards the emperor a position which was by no means that of an unconditional vassal. The imprisonment of his father-in-law, Philip of Hesse, had now continued for upwards of four years,—we shall see presently in what manner he was treated,—and Maurice thought it high time that he should be released. In October 1550 Maurice was commissioned by the emperor to assist in besieging the city of Magdeburg, which still resolutely opposed the adoption of the interim. The siege, in which other princes, of whom Duke George of Mecklenburg was one, participated, continued for a year and seven months. It was languidly prosecuted for a time; but

[1] The Confessions to which we refer were the above-mentioned *Confessio Wirtembergica* of Brenz, and the *Confessio Saxonica* (*Repetitio Conf. Augustanæ*).

Maurice at length took into his service the Count of Heideck, a Protestant, who had fought in the Schmalkaldic War, and distinguished himself in the Swabian army, but had been proscribed by the emperor. On the 3d of September 1551 a truce was declared, and in the following November the city capitulated. Magdeburg was forced to surrender to Maurice at discretion, and was assured of its privileges only on the payment of a heavy requisition. It was to accept the last decrees of the Diet of Augsburg in regard to secular matters only, and not those relating to religion; the interim consequently was set aside. Maurice became Burgrave of Magdeburg.

During the siege, which merits more particular mention, the city displayed extraordinary courage. The services of the sanctuary were continued amid the thunder of the cannon. As Bugenhagen had once sustained the faith of the Wittenbergers, Erasmus Alber now supported that of the people of Magdeburg, assisting them at the same time to retain their good humour. When the tower of St. James fell down, the burghers jestingly declared that it, like themselves, was unwilling to accept the interim. After the capitulation, Maurice treated the citizens with great consideration. Many who had regarded him as Antichrist, or, at the least, as Antichrist's forerunner, now beheld in him a generous victor.

Maurice's plans against the emperor also revealed themselves at this time. Charles was most unwilling to believe that Maurice had any secret designs against him, but the fact nevertheless remained. Before the capture of Magdeburg, Maurice had concluded an alliance with Henry II. of France, successor to Francis I., for the protection of religious liberty in Germany, and especially for the final release of Maurice's father-in-law, the landgrave, in whose behalf several princes had ere now interceded in vain.

Let us tarry for a moment to consider the sufferings and torments to which Philip was exposed.[1] He was, in the first

[1] We follow the authentic reports presented by ROMMEL, ii. pp. 515-550. Comp. MARHEINEKE, iv. pp. 487 sqq.

place, dragged from one city to another, lodged in miserable quarters, and treated in a most unprincely manner. Notwithstanding this, however, he retained his princely dignity even in his bonds. From his dungeon he governed his land, in which the enemy, in the persons of imperial and Spanish commissaries, externally bore sway. He entered into all the minutiæ of agriculture and domestic economy. His councillors occasionally sent him some wine or a few casks of Eimbecker beer for his refreshment. In the transportation of these gifts, Hessian waggoners were employed, who managed also to convey letters to the prisoner. While Philip was at Donauwörth, his faithful servant, Simon Bing, sent him a prayer-book. He exchanged the most touching letters with his "dear wife." Melanchthon also wrote him a letter of consolation. So great, however, was the indiscretion of his guards, that the Spanish captain insisted upon reading all the letters which arrived for Philip before the latter received them, in order that Alba might be apprised of their contents. Philip's son-in-law, Maurice, wrote him that nothing on God's earth so distressed him as this shameful treatment. Philip returned answer that the plague had broken out among the soldiers appointed to guard him, and that he himself was apprehensive of being attacked by the disease. He was disgusted with the odour of garlic which was exhaled from his guards, and their incessant talking was so burdensome to him as to frequently disturb his sleep. Instead of four guards, the appointed number, from ten to twelve were usually seated in the narrow prison chamber. When the landgrave slept, they would draw the curtains apart to see "whether he had escaped through a crack or a mouse-hole." The fact that all this was happening while Maurice was enjoying himself vexed the prisoner exceedingly, nor did he hesitate to express his chagrin in his letters. He wrote as follows to the two electors:[1]—"If your graces were as diligent in my affairs as in banqueting, entertaining your friends, and playing, my

[1] Maurice of Saxony and Joachim of Brandenburg.

condition would long ago have been improved." If these gentlemen, he declared, thus continued to fear a little anger and resentment, to which they might expose themselves in interceding more heartily for him, their reputation with their contemporaries and with posterity would be injured—their conduct would be "recorded in history." The Hessian councillors, and Princes William and Louis, also wrote to the electors, stating that "whoever was acquainted with the temperament of the landgrave, must apprehend that, if his imprisonment lasted much longer, he would become a prey to melancholy, insanity, or death." His sufferings were not yet to end, however. On the contrary, the emperor, angered afresh by something that the landgrave had written, deprived the sick man, who was afflicted with a severe cough, of his physician (Megebach), his secretary, and other servants; two pages only were left to him, and allowed to sleep in his room. Paper and ink were also denied him. More compassion than the emperor manifested towards the captive landgrave was shown by the emperor's sister, Maria, Governess of the Netherlands. She, in company with the landgravine and many ladies of the court, prostrated herself before the emperor, and besought his mercy for Philip, but received from him only the answer that "in *his own time* he would show himself gracious." The sole concession that Christina obtained was permission to visit her sick husband at Speier. (She afterwards died of consumption, the course of which was accelerated by grief. Before her death, she once more, by letter, petitioned the emperor in behalf of her husband.) The removal of the prisoner from Speier to Worms afforded a lamentable spectacle. Seated upon a miserable jade, unarmed, and surrounded by Spanish soldiers, Philip was escorted from one prison to another like a common criminal, while the populace ran after him, shouting, "There goes the rebellious and faithless rogue and good-for-nought!"

The landgrave was finally transported from Donauwörth and Nördlingen to Oudenarde, in the Netherlands, and from

the latter place to Mechlin, where he was lodged in the rear of the imperial palace. There he edified himself with the writings of some of the fathers of the Church,—Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose,—whose works he caused to be brought to him in his prison. The Holy Scriptures, however, were his chief consolation. The passages that seemed to him especially applicable to his situation (such, for instance, as, "Hope maketh not ashamed"), he underlined with red crayon, and also commented on them in the margin. There still exist in the library at Cassel two folio Bibles containing such glosses. It was seldom that the prisoner was permitted to breathe the fresh air. On rare occasions he was placed in a carriage and driven about, as he himself expresses it, "like a lion or a show." After performing his morning devotions, he had nothing to do but to walk up and down in his room, or to play a game then in vogue, called *Centum tres*, or occasionally chess or nine-pins. "You," he wrote to his councillors at Cassel, "have the advantage of me; you can have your wives with you: you are with your friends; I am with enemies: you are with true believers; I am with a superstitious people." The Spaniards beset him with religious discourses. "They regard Lutherans," so writes the landgrave, "as worse than Turks or Moors." They thought that the killing of all the Lutherans, if they could but have accomplished it, would be as efficacious as an indulgence. These theological disputes were forbidden at last. Philip continued his care for his country and household in his Netherland prison. The place in which he was at this time confined was at least clean, and a gratifying testimony to his humanity is borne by the order which he issued shortly after his removal thither, that "the bad, unclean prisons" [in his own dominions], "where serpents and toads are harboured, and many persons perish," should be amended with all possible speed; for to suffer prisoners thus to perish was, he declared, a great sin, and one that God would not permit to go unpunished. He also touchingly commends his dog to the kind care of Prince William.

At the time of the second Diet at Augsburg (July 1550), the two electors had again petitioned for the release of the landgrave; their intercession was, however, fruitless. An unsuccessful attempt for the deliverance of Philip, made toward the close of the year,[1] only aggravated his hardships. He was now deprived of all his servants. The thought of the victims sacrificed on this occasion (several Hessians who had participated in the adventure were hanged) had a saddening effect upon the spirits of the landgrave, though he held that the sufferers had but performed their duty as his subjects. It was feared that the profound melancholy of the landgrave would culminate in insanity. He was confined in a chamber ten feet long, the windows of which were nailed up. Even from this dungeon he despatched solicitations to his friends, requesting not only money, articles of wearing apparel, and medicines, but also books, such as the works of Eusebius and Chrysostom, histories of the emperors and popes, etc.

At length the hour of his release sounded, being hastened by the further course of events in the empire.

In March of the year 1552, Maurice, in conjunction with other German princes, John Albert of Mecklenburg, and the son of the captive landgrave, William of Hesse, supported by troops of the Margrave of Brandenburg, publicly took the field.

Maurice marched through Franconia and Swabia, took possession in April of the city of Augsburg, and in May advanced as far as Insbruck. Wherever he went, he abolished the imperial regulations and reinstated the Protestant magistrates and preachers who had been expelled from office. In his public manifesto against the emperor, he stated three points which he assigned as his reasons for undertaking the present war; they were as follows:—(1) The suppression of religion; (2) The continued imprisonment of the landgrave; (3) The violation of the laws of the empire. In the meantime, the King of France, with his army, had invaded the three bishoprics of Metz, Tull, and Verdun. The Turks simultaneously

[1] For particulars, see ROMMEL, *l.c.*

made an invasion into Transylvania. In short, the emperor found himself pressed on all sides and under the necessity of seeking peace. The first negotiations to that end were concluded at Linz, with the emperor's brother Ferdinand. A Diet was then appointed to be held at Passau, pending which, a truce was to be observed. The emperor, meantime, had assembled his troops in the highlands. Maurice attacked them and was victorious. The emperor fled to Villach in Carinthia. Maurice next appeared before Frankfort-on-the-Main, which was garrisoned by a strong body of imperial troops. While he was engaged in besieging this city, the Bohemian chancellor brought to his camp articles of peace. Maurice accepted them, and on the 2d of August 1552, the treaty of Passau was concluded between Ferdinand, king of the Romans, on the one hand, and the Elector Maurice and his allies on the other. The first condition was the release of Landgrave Philip. John Frederick, elector of Saxony, who had followed the emperor everywhere as his prisoner, had received the offer of liberty in May, when Maurice was approaching Insbruck, but had not then accepted it. "I would gladly," he declared jestingly, "abide by the court, if the court would abide by me." It was not until the 22d of August that he set out for his home, in company with his son and his friend, Lucas Kranach. On the 24th of September, the three were greeted at Jena with acclamations of joy, and on the 26th they entered Weimar. On the 14th of September (the day of the exaltation of the cross [Holy-rood Day]), Melanchthon, in his own name and in the name of the University of Wittenberg, addressed an affectionate epistle to John Frederick, in testimony of his joy that the Lord had now turned the elector's cross and had raised him to honour again. The elector (17th October) thanked his Wittenberg theologians for their sympathy, and expressed the hope that God would continue graciously to preserve His word and His Church.[1] Landgrave Philip was finally released from his

[1] *Corp. Ref.* vii. pp. 1095, 1108, and 1109.

"custody" of five years' duration on the 4th of September. His hair had become grey during his captivity, and he was broken in body and in mind. His meeting with his people was painfully sad. At Marburg he received the members of the University at the castle. On the following Sunday (12th September) he arrived at Cassel. The burghers poured forth from the city to meet him and escort him to the cathedral. There Philip knelt before the monument of his wife, and continued in the same posture until the close of the sermon and the commencement of the Ambrosian chant. On the 17th of September his entire dominions celebrated the return of their beloved sovereign. The Swiss Church, also, testified its joy at the event. Henry Bullinger greeted the returned landgrave in a congratulatory letter of the 1st of November.

The second condition of peace stipulated for by Maurice had reference to the interim and its abolition. It was also determined that a Diet should be held within six months, for the purpose of considering whether the existent differences could be best removed by a general Christian council, or by a special *German* ecclesiastical assembly, or in some other way. In the meantime, neither party was to interfere with the other. It was agreed, in the third place, that the judicial rights of both parties should be equal. In the fourth place, it was determined that investigations should be instituted in regard to complaints relative to alleged violations of the liberties of the empire, and that an amnesty should be proclaimed by way of indemnification for such violations. And finally, in the fifth place, it was agreed that the sentence of proscription passed upon those who had taken part in the Schmalkaldic War should be abrogated.

But before this treaty of Passau had been formally sanctioned, an incident occurred which deferred the formal conclusion of peace. Albert of Brandenburg, who until this time had been the friend of Maurice, having grown up with him and shared with him the perils of war, now quarrelled with the Saxon prince on account of the stipulations of this same treaty of

Passau. Its conditions failing to harmonize with his designs, he refused to be bound by it, and prosecuted the war on his own account. He ravaged the Rhenish territories, Westphalia, and Franconia.[1] Maurice felt constrained to put a stop to these depredations. He accordingly advanced against the margrave at the head of an army, and defeated him in a bloody engagement near the village of Sievershausen, in the territory of Lüneburg (9th July 1553). When already assured of his victory, Maurice was mortally wounded in the conflict, and died on the 12th of July 1553, at the age of thirty-two. While he was incontestably the possessor of eminent talents, and one who, by the mere intrepidity of his bearing, impressed all with whom he came in contact, his character has, from various standpoints, been variously judged. He can scarcely be cleared from the charge of a craftiness of mind which frequently proceeded to great lengths and often expressed itself in a duplicity of conduct. The Elector John Frederick insisted that his cousin formed no exception to the truth of the proverb, *Ein Meissner, ein Gleissner* ["Show me a Misnian, and I'll show you a dissembler"].[2] Whether he was sincere in the profession of his faith or not, who will venture to judge? Of deep religious motives we certainly find no traces in his conduct. Religion with him was subordinate to politics. Landgrave Philip, who knew him well, accused him of dealing with religion as with secular things (such as goods, estates, fields, meadows), as if one should say, "Leave me this, and I will leave you that."[3] And yet Providence made

[1] "Margrave Albert," writes Melanchthon (12th July) to the King of Denmark, "has done a great deal of damage around Nuremberg, having burned one hundred and eighty villages . . . besides this, he has demanded two tons of gold, and powder and guns; he has also impoverished the Bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg, and has now marched towards Frankfort-on-the-Main" (*Corp. Ref.* vii. p. 1026). On these ravages comp. also a letter from Melanchthon to Calvin, written in October, *l.c.* p. 1086, and *Corp. Ref.* viii. p. 198.

[2] HAUSER, p. 232.

[3] HAUSER, *ibid.* RANKE (vol. v. p. 317) remarks concerning Maurice: "His was a nature the like of which cannot be found in Germany. So cautious and secretive, so enterprising and energetic was he; possessing so much foresight, yet so perfectly at home in the execution of his plans; and withal so destitute

use of this very man to conduct the struggle of the Reformation in Germany to its conclusion. What all the diplomatic negotiations at the various Diets could not effect,—what all the religious conferences and mediatorial efforts could not accomplish, was performed by the craft of an apparent apostate. Humanly speaking, Germany has him to thank for religious and political liberty. He was succeeded in the government of Saxony by his brother, Duke Augustus. The latter concluded the treaty of Naumburg with the former elector, John Frederick, by the provisions of which treaty John Frederick formally resigned the electorate, but retained the title of elector. This sorely-tried prince died soon afterwards (3d March 1554), having enjoyed his liberty during a year and a half only. But a few hours before his death, he exhorted his family and his friends to be constant to the Evangelical doctrine. He was succeeded by his son, John Frederick II., surnamed the Mediate.

On the 5th of February 1555, the *Diet of Augsburg* was finally opened by King Ferdinand, it having been postponed during the two preceding years on account of the political conjunctures. Ferdinand, who was more pacifically disposed than his brother, revealed his intention to establish a permanent peace even in case a religious understanding could not yet be arrived at. And, indeed, such an understanding was not to be thought of. The Protestants were resolved not to depart from the Augsburg Confession. The Romish party, on the other hand, was willing to grant a peace to the Protestants only upon condition that the latter should return to the bosom of the Catholic Church. The imperial commissioner, Otto, Cardinal-Bishop of Augsburg, and Count Truchsess-Waldburg

of fidelity and personal consideration; Maurice was a man of flesh and blood, a person whose importance as a working power was due not to any system of ideas which he had formed, but to his bare existence and presence. His procedures were of decisive moment in the fortunes of Protestantism. His defection from that system after he had once embraced it, brought it to the verge of ruin; his subsequent defection from the emperor was the means of the restoration of liberty." See the further description of the character of Maurice, pp. 221 sqq.

by birth, was, in particular, a most vigorous opposer of all plans tending to peace. In the midst of the Diet, tidings of the death of Pope Julius III. arrived. The Papal legate and the Bishop of Augsburg immediately departed for the purpose of being present at the conclave. The choice of the cardinals fell upon Marcellus II., who in one month was succeeded by Paul IV. During the vacancies of the pontifical see, Ferdinand was enabled the more freely to prosecute his negotiations for peace. There were still all sorts of objections to overcome. Special difficulty was occasioned by the question as to the course to be pursued in regard to ecclesiastical estates, in the case of spiritual princes who joined the Evangelical Church. This was termed the question of "spiritual reservation" (*reservatum ecclesiasticum*). It was the cause of many sharp words. The Protestants were charged with appearing to be more concerned about their *fiscus* than about their *Christus*. So far, indeed, did the controversy proceed, that a dissolution of the assembly seemed imminent. An agreement was finally arrived at, however, concerning the following principles. The adherents of the Augsburg Confession, as well as of the old religion, should be permitted to enjoy complete and undisturbed liberty; "neither party should molest the other;" no state should force its religion upon any other state or its subjects. In regard to ecclesiastical estates, it was agreed that such as were occupied by the Protestants previous to the treaty of Passau should remain in their possession. The Protestants were also placed on an equality with the Catholics in a political point of view, access to the Imperial Chamber being accorded to them.[1] All these concessions were, however, expressly confined to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. All Confessions except the Catholic and Lutheran were excluded from the terms of the agreement, the Reformed

[1] "It was also determined that the Evangelical princes should again be entitled to their customary places in the Imperial Chamber, and that difference in religion should henceforth form no hindrance in secular matters and offices. This recess is *somewhat milder* than the recesses of former Diets" (MELANCHTHON in his "Annals of 1555," *Corp. Ref.* viii. p. 652).

Churches being, of course, excluded among the rest. This *religious peace*, which brings the history of the German Reformation to a conclusion, was promulgated on the 25th and 26th of September 1555.

The above-mentioned agreement was a virtual recognition of the dualism of religious confessions so far as Germany was concerned, and the unity of the empire was thereby undoubtedly fractured in the same measure in which that unity was regarded as dependent upon the unity of religious creed. On the basis of this very agreement, however, although not until after the lapse of more than one century, the nation became convinced that its political unity is not bound up with a confessional unity, but that it is possible for the German people, even while entertaining different religious convictions, to stand together on the soil of one and the same fatherland, and resist the encroachments of foreign powers.

Soon after the establishment of the Peace of Augsburg, Charles V., weary of the ceaseless conflicts and the unrest which pertained to his exalted position as ruler of the German Empire, laid aside his crown and retired to the cloister of St. Justus, near Placentia in Estremadura. There he died on the 21st of September 1558, at the age of fifty-nine.

CHAPTER XXXI.

JOHN CALVIN—HIS YOUTH—HIS INSTRUCTION IN THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION—HIS FIRST LABOURS AT GENEVA—HIS BANISHMENT AND RESIDENCE AT STRASSBURG—HIS MARRIAGE—SADOLET—CALVIN RECALLED TO GENEVA.

THE Peace of Augsburg (1555) forms the (relative) conclusion of the history of the German Reformation. It does not, however, conclude the history of Reform in Switzerland and other countries. We nevertheless adopt the period in a general reference, it being our intention to treat of the events which occurred after that time in a subsequent series of lectures. At present, therefore, we have merely to notice those incidents in the Reformation in Switzerland and elsewhere which fall within or near the period indicated, without confining ourselves too strictly to the limits of the year 1555.

We dropped the thread of our history of the Swiss Reformation after touching upon the reformatory movements in Romanic Switzerland and Geneva. Resuming our narrative at this point, we introduce without delay an individual who, in company with Luther and Zwingle, must be styled the third personage of the Reformation, when the actual heroes thereof are discussed,—we refer to Calvin. In terming him the *third* in the trio of Reformers alluded to, we express no order of *merit*. In point of *time* he is indisputably the third.

When Calvin's star appeared on the historical horizon, the star of Luther, although brilliant still, was near its setting,—we refer, of course, to Luther's bodily life on earth. Zwingle and Œcolampadius had already been removed from this world

when Calvin first set foot on Swiss soil. Calvin was a contemporary of Melanchthon and Bullinger, rather than of Luther and Zwingle. Even in reference to Geneva, his work was not that of a Reformer who, battling with an existing order of things, succeeds in overthrowing the ancient system, but rather that of one who has erected a new system on the ruins of the old. In a word, the importance of his labours in the cause of Reform is due not to their negative, but to their positive tendency. Yet even he found much that it was necessary to clear away before he could build.

John Calvin (Jean Cauvin, Calderius)[1] was born on the 10th of July 1509, at Noyon in Picardy. He sprang from a respectable family, the members of which, although not wealthy, were in comfortable circumstances. His father, John Gérard, of the village of Pont l'Evêque, was at one time, like the father of Bucer, a cooper, but subsequently became fiscal-procurator of the county of Noyon and secretary of the bishop. His mother, whose maiden name was Jeanne Lefranc, was a native of Cambrai. Young Calvin received a good—indeed, we may say a superior—education in connection with the children of the house of Montmort, a noble family. In comparison with Luther and Zwingle, the life of Calvin exhibits from the outset a more aristocratic impress, although he himself, like the German and the Swiss Reformers, issued

[1] The first who wrote a narrative of Calvin's life was Theodore Beza, in 1564. Modern history had for a long time but brief notices to present. Bretschneider, general superintendent of the Lutheran Church in Gotha, first contributed to the *Reformationsalmanach* of 1821 a short sketch of "the character and spirit of the Reformer." The last thirty years have been productive of a number of more extensive presentations of the important life to which we refer. Among his biographers may be mentioned the following:—PAUL HENRY, *Leben Johann Calvins, des grossen Reformators*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1835-44; ERNST STÄHELIN (in vol. iv. of the *Väter und Begründer*, etc., Elberfeld, 1863, 1 and 2); BUNGENER, *Calvin, sa vie, son œuvre, et ses écrits*; Paris, 1862 (Eng. Trans., Edinburgh, Clark). From the Catholic (not Ultramontane) standpoint: KAMPSCHULTE, *Johann Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf.*, 1 vol., Leipsic, 1869. We shall refer hereafter to Galliffe and Calvin's opponents. Calvin's letters occupy an important place in the history of his life: *Lettres de Jean Calvin, par Jules Bonnet* (*Lettres Françaises*), Paris, 1854, 2 vols. An English translation of his French and Latin letters was published at Edinburgh in 1857 (2 vols.).

from the ranks of the burghers. The boy early distinguished himself not only by the excellence of his powers of apprehension, but also by his strict morality and his zeal for the observance of the same by others. He was frequently the censor of his playmates. His schoolfellows are said to have nicknamed him the "Accusative." His father designed him for the priesthood; and when he was but twelve years old, he received a prebend from the Bishop of Noyon to aid him in the prosecution of his studies. The Catholics afterwards reproached him on this account, saying that the Church, in nourishing him at her breast, had cherished a viper in her bosom. Together with the sons of the house of Montmort, he repaired, when in his fifteenth year, to Paris, where he enjoyed the instruction of the celebrated Maturinus Corderius (Cordier), in the College de la Manche. Calvin afterwards spoke with much feeling of this instructor. It was to him, the Ciceronian, that Calvin was indebted for the pure and idiomatic style which distinguishes his Latin writings.[1] In the College de Montaigu (*ab acuto monte*) he studied dialectics under the direction of a learned Spaniard. At this period of his life he was still heartily devoted to the religion of his fathers, and conscientiously complied with the rules of the Church.[2] He also took pleasure in the writings of the Schoolmen; they were, indeed, for a time his favourite authors, and he indisputably derived much instruction from them. Although he had already received the tonsure, and, as has previously been remarked, was in occupation of a prebend,[3] with the consent of his father he resolved to study law. (This incident in his life bears some resemblance to a circum-

[1] He dedicated his commentary on the First Epistle to the Thessalonians to Corderius.

[2] "I was," Calvin subsequently confessed, "so stiff-necked an adherent of Papal superstition that it seemed impossible that I could ever be drawn out of that sewer." It is somewhat remarkable that, a few years later, Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuit order, sat at the feet of the same teacher who had instructed Calvin, in the same College in which the Reformer had studied.

[3] He had, however, exchanged the prebend of Pont l'Evêque for that of St. Martin de Marteville, the one which was first presented to him.

stance in the life of Luther.) He therefore repaired to the famous law school of Orleans, in which Peter Stella (Pierre l'Etoile) was a professor. There Calvin's assiduity in study was equalled only by the quickness of his apprehension and the surprising fidelity of his memory. Without solicitation on his own part he was made Doctor of Laws. It was not his intention, in devoting himself to the study of jurisprudence, to abandon that of theology; a change in his religious views was, however, already in course of preparation. Through the instrumentality of his kinsman, Peter Olivetanus, his attention had ere now been directed to the improprieties of the Romish Church. His own study of the Bible had also suggested to him many new ideas. In the year 1529 he removed from Orleans to Bourges, where the renowned Alciat was teaching jurisprudence. At the latter place he formed the acquaintance of a German, Melchior Wolmar, a Swabian by birth, from the city of Rotweil. By him Calvin was apprised of the events which had been taking place in Germany since Luther had originated the great religious movement. From this time Calvin studied the Bible with increased diligence, and, in order that he might be enabled to examine it in the original, he applied himself most assiduously to the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages. He also preached from time to time. While at Bourges, Calvin was called home by the death of his father; he, however, went soon afterwards to Paris, where he devoted himself entirely to theology. At the same time a mighty change took place in his inner man. Having now broken with the old faith, it remained for him to erect a new system within himself. At about this time the little flock of Evangelical believers in Paris had been strengthened and confirmed. To them Calvin joined himself, attended their meetings, and delivered lectures before them. His discourses generally closed with the words, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" It would be a mistake to suppose that the Christian earnestness which now took possession of his soul diverted him from the study of the ancient classics. On the

contrary, Calvin commenced his literary career by publishing Seneca's treatise, *De Clementia*, on which he wrote a commentary. It has been suggested that the exhibition of this mirror of morals was an apologetic effort on the part of Calvin to influence the King of France to manifest clemency towards the Protestants, or that he was thereby attempting dogmatically to indicate how far even the natural man, without the help of the gospel, may proceed in the cultivation of virtue; but these are conjectures which have no secure basis in history. Calvin, who at this time had attained the age of twenty-four, was an aspiring man of learning, and it was in this character that he edited the above-mentioned treatise. The time, however, soon arrived when he was to become eminent not only as a man of learning, but as the representative of the Evangelical party. The new rector of the Paris University, Nicholas Copus, was to be inaugurated into office on All Saints' Day, 1533, when he was expected to deliver the discourse customary on such occasions. This discourse was composed for him by Calvin, and contained a defence of the Evangelical principles then undergoing persecution at the hands of the court and the clergy, and vigorous assaults upon the "sophists," many of whom it was not difficult to discover in the circle of auditors. The address occasioned much commotion. It was ill received by the king, and also by the Sorbonne and Parliament. Copus, who, from having delivered it, was regarded as its composer, fled to Basel, his native city. It soon, however, transpired that Calvin, and not Copus, was the author of the address. The young man was accordingly sought for at his residence, and, not being found, his papers were seized. Calvin himself now sought refuge in flight, disguised, it is said, as a vine-dresser. He repaired to the dominions of Queen Margaret of Navarre, the generous protector of the Protestants, and lived for a time with his friend the Canon Louis de Tillet, pastor at Claix, near Angoulême. There Calvin led a quiet and retired life, under the name of the Sieur d'Espeville. The people, who

were astonished at his Hellenic learning, called him nothing but the Greek of Claix (*le Grec de Claix*). In a grotto near Poitiers, which still bears the name of "Calvin's Grotto," he held meetings for prayer with his friends. He also visited the little residence of Nerac in Béarn, where he met with Roussel and Le Fêvre. He ventured after a time to return to Paris, but, being subjected to fresh persecutions, sought an asylum at Basel, where he arrived in the year 1535. There he made acquaintance with the learned Simon Grynæus, and there, also, he wrote his most important theological work, the materials for which had for some time been collecting in his mind, and which, like Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, received considerable revision and alteration at various times. As Melanchthon's work was the principal doctrinal work of the Lutheran theology, so the justly-lauded treatise of Calvin forms even now the principal work of the Reformed theology of the sixteenth century, — we refer, of course, to the *Institutio Religionis Christianæ* ("Institute of the Christian Religion").[1] Without binding ourselves to the phraseology of the first edition,[2] we take occasion here to present a general

[1] Previous to the issue of the *Institute*, Calvin's only theological work had been a polemical tractate against the Anabaptists, combating their idea of the soul's sleep (*De psychopannychia*). The *Institutio* was published at Basel, in Latin, in 1536 (the idea that an earlier edition appeared in French in 1535 has been shown to be untenable). For information concerning the various editions and revisions of the work, we refer to the valuable collection of the works of Calvin, edited by the Strassburg Professors Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss (Braunschweig, 1863 sqq.). The *Institutio* is there presented in accordance with the editions of 1536, 1539–54, 1559, and the French translation of 1541. A pocket edition of convenient size was published by Tholuck in 1846. The book has been translated into almost all languages. It was translated into modern German by F. A. Krummacher (1823), and into English by Henry Beveridge, 2 vols. (Clark).

[2] The first edition, of 1536, follows, in quite an elementary manner, the course of the Catechism, treating—(1) of the Law (the Decalogue), (2) of the Creed (*Symbolum apostolicum*), (3) of Prayer (the Our Father, etc.), (4) of the Sacraments. To these divisions are added several *excursus* on the false sacraments, on Christian liberty, and on ecclesiastical authority and polity. In the later much-expanded editions the whole work is divided into four books, the first of which treats of the knowledge of God as the Creator, the second is devoted to a consideration of the same Being as the Redeemer, and the third exhibits Him as the Sanctifier (Father, Son, and Holy Ghost). The fourth book treats of the Church and the means of grace therein instituted.

view of the entire work, as far as this is possible within the narrow limits of one chapter. We may with the more propriety pursue this course, since, notwithstanding all the formal alterations of the work, its fundamental ideas have continued unchanged. Let us first, however, examine the dedication to King Francis I. (dated 23d August 1535), with which the work is prefaced.

Like the apologists of the primitive time, in their dedications to the Roman emperors, Calvin, taking his stand upon the law, demonstrates at once the injustice of condemning the Protestants on mere accusation. He defends them against the reproaches which were cast upon them. It is claimed, says he, that they teach a new religion; but their religion can appear new only to those to whom Christ and His gospel are a novelty. Our opponents, he continues, demand miracles; but these are not necessary, since no new revelation is put forth. The miracles of which the Romish Church boast are frequently of a very questionable character. Furthermore, Satan himself may work miracles! To those who cite against us the Fathers of the Church, we answer, in the first place, that in a majority of cases the Fathers are on our side. We confess, however, that their writings contain much of error, and therefore we cannot recognise them as authoritative. Many call us disturbers of the peace; Elijah also was accused of troubling Israel. Christ and His apostles were themselves declared to be disturbers of the peace. The peace which has hitherto been enjoyed by the Church was the peace of Sardanapalus, and from such repose she should be awakened. We are charged with separating ourselves from the Church. This charge is untrue; we do not separate from the Church of Christ, but from the Church of Rome. The true, the invisible Church, cannot be pointed out by the hand of man. And yet that alone, and not the visible Church, is infallible. History affords abundant evidence of the contradictory declarations of those ecclesiastical authorities, the Councils. Some there

undoubtedly are who use their liberty as a cloak of iniquity. False brethren have crept in among us, and have excited dissensions. In contemplating such cases we must comfort ourselves with the words of Christ, who proclaimed that offences would come. But, as a proof that such offences do not originate with us, we can with a good conscience appeal to our conduct, which gives no occasion for complaint. Calvin then again entreats the king, who had turned away his heart from the Evangelicals, no longer to listen to the false whisperings of those who had ensnared him, and closes with the following words:—"Amid whatever persecutions we may be called upon to endure, in dungeons and in iron chains, on the rack or at the stake, we will submit to the uttermost, like sheep led to the slaughter. We will possess our souls in patience, and hope in the Lord and in His mighty arm. May the Lord, the King of kings, O most mighty and illustrious king, preserve thy throne by righteousness, and thy seat by equity."

In the *Institutes;* Calvin, like Melanchthon and Zwingle, pursues the psychological method of presentation, tracing out the origin of religion in the human breast. There exists, he affirms, in every man some consciousness of the divine essence (*sensus divinitatis*). God makes Himself known to us in the creation and government of the world. Man is a world in miniature (microcosm). But man's natural knowledge of God is darkened by sin. It was requisite that there should be a revelation of God through the medium of His word, and such a revelation is given to us in the Holy Scriptures. The authority of the Scriptures is not based upon the authority of the Church. The prophets and apostles are of greater antiquity than the Church. The testimony of Scripture harmonizes with the testimony of the Holy Spirit in our hearts. A revelation being thus given to us once for all in the Scriptures, we should not grasp after new revelations, as do fanatics and enthusiasts. Such invented revelations Calvin regards as machinations of Satan, who transforms himself into an angel of light. Scripture, as the organ of

the Spirit, is the depository of the knowledge of God, or, more particularly, of the Triune God. God created man good, but by the sin of Adam sin was entailed upon us, his descendants. Calvin apprehends original or hereditary sin in a strictly Augustinian sense. He regards it not simply as a disease, an infirmity (as does Zwingle), but as a total perversion of human nature. He rejects the mild views of the Church fathers who preceded Augustine, and who attribute a remnant of liberty to fallen man, and teaches, with Augustine, and also with Luther and Melanchthon, that man has by the sin of Adam lôst all liberty. In the very first edition of the *Institutes*, it is declared that not one spark of good can be found in the natural man from his head to his feet. Everything worthy of praise that appears in him is a work of grace. Our salvation is dependent solely upon the mercy of God, and not upon our worthiness. Man must, however, lay hold upon divine grace by faith. Calvin is as far as Melanchthon from accepting as faith mere historic belief, which, he declares, deserves not the name of faith, it being the faith which devils have. True faith is true trust (*fiducia*). Whatsoever proceeds not from faith is sin; hence Calvin regards the virtues of the heathen as brilliant vices. But faith itself is a gift from above. Man must needs be born again, and of this new birth only the elect are made partakers. The doctrine of election was further developed by Calvin at a subsequent period, but its fundamental features appear in the first edition of the *Institutes*. It forms one of the chief elements of the Calvinistic system. This doctrine, which teaches that from pure grace God gives to one what He denies to another, is intended to humble the pride of man. We must bow before the will of God, which we are not able to resist. The question whether God be the author of evil, Calvin calls both difficult and involved (*difficilis et involuta*). He seeks to solve it by making a distinction between the *will* and the *command* of God. The evil which takes place in the world is accomplished in accordance with the will of

God, but it does not occur at His command. In a certain sense, even the fall of Adam may be regarded as an event of divine ordering. As there are vessels of the glory of God, there are also vessels of His wrath, and both exist from a divine necessity. But even the damnation of the wicked must conduce to the glorification of God.

The doctrine of the *Church*, like the doctrine of Election, occupies an important place in Calvin's system. We have already seen, in the dedication of the *Institutes* to Francis I., that he distinguishes between a visible and an invisible Church. To Calvin, however, the Church is not *merely* the communion of the elect, but, in respect of its external form, it is a divine sanative institution [*Heilsanstalt*], which man in his natural rudeness and indolence requires. "The Church is our mother," is the doctrine of Calvin as well as of the Roman Catholic Church, and he who will not hear the Church must be regarded as a publican and heathen. Only (and herein consists the difference between Calvin's view and the view of the Romish Church) the word, according to Calvin, is not bound to the Church, but rather the Church is bound to the word of God. Furthermore, he does not regard the Church as consisting in the mass of the priests, as a body distinct from the laity, but, like Luther, Calvin supports the tenet that every true Christian is a priest of God. Hence the Calvinistic system accords to the so-called laity a share in the representation and government of the Church, and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. The Church thus appointed has the right to enact laws through its synods, and to exercise ecclesiastical discipline through its presbyteries and consistories. Its modes of discipline are, however, of a spiritual character. It is inadmissible to confound spiritual and secular government. While the State pursues earthly aims, the Church is intent upon heavenly things. It is, nevertheless, the bounden duty of the State to protect the Church with the arm of secular authority, and to aid her in the attainment of her purposes. Hence the State should

take measures against blasphemy. (We shall see what practical application Calvin makes of this theory.)

The *sacraments* are regarded by Calvin not as mere *signs*, by which we make known that we belong to Christ ("tokens of allegiance," as Zwingle calls them), but, moreover, as *visible pledges* of God's favour towards us, instituted for the strengthening of our weak faith.[1] They are *seals*, Calvin declares,—remarking further that a seal, considered in and by itself, apart from the document to which it is affixed, is valueless and insignificant; and yet, when attached to that document, it serves to strengthen and confirm the same. From this it will appear that the Lord's Supper is to Calvin more than a mere memorial repast. Indeed, Zwingle's view of the Eucharist seemed to him profane. Calvin celebrates therein a real union of Christ with the soul of the believer (*vinculum caritatis*). He, however, differed from Luther in that he did not look for Christ's presence in the bread, but assumed that a mediatory operation of the Holy Spirit takes place. Christ does not come down from heaven into the bread, he declares, any more than the sun comes from heaven to warm us and give us light. The orb of day diffuses its heat and its illuminating rays directly from heaven. Calvin, like Zwingle, denies that the unbelieving partake of the body of Christ. The difference between the Zwinglian and the Calvinistic view is a relative difference, to which reference will be made on some future occasion. It is needless to say that Calvin, in common with the other Reformers, repudiated the external veneration of the sacrament of the altar, the worship of the host, and the sacrifice of the mass.

The printing of this work, which excels every previous achievement in the domain to which it belongs, was not completed when Calvin quitted Basel. He repaired to Ferrara, in Italy, to the court of the young Duchess Rénée,

[1] The following occurs in the very first edition of the *Institutes*:—"Sacramentum est signum externum, quo bonam suam erga nos voluntatem Dominus nobis repræsentat ac testificatur, ad sustinendam fidei nostræ imbecillitatem."

the wife of Hercules d'Este. In the neighbourhood of this lady, who was a daughter of Louis XII. of France, many Protestants made their abode. Here, also, he introduced himself under the name of Charles d'Espeville. He conducted the religious meetings held by the Protestants at this place, and even after leaving Ferrara maintained an epistolary correspondence with the duchess, who always regarded him as a chosen vessel of the Lord. It has been stated that Calvin visited Aosta in Piedmont, on his return from Ferrara.[1] He sojourned, it is said, at a certain farm-house (the *Grange de Bibian*), whence, when persecution threatened, he escaped with two companions; the mountain pass which he traversed in his journey into the Valais is said still to bear the name of "Calvin's Window."[2] The authenticity of these statements has, however, been called in question. Whatever may be the truth in regard to them, it is certain that after leaving Italy, Calvin returned to France. He was not, however, permitted to remain there. "I am driven," he writes, "from the land of my birth: every step which I take toward a foreign country costs me tears; yet so let it be. If Truth merit not a dwelling-place in France, neither will I abide there. I will accept the lot which falls to *her* share." It was his intention to repair to Germany in company with his brother Antony, and to visit Basel and Strassburg on the way; but, as the country was swarming with soldiers (by reason of the war which had broken out between Charles V. and Francis I.), instead of taking the direct road through Lorraine, he made a circuit through Savoy and thus arrived at Geneva. There, as he himself confesses, he was detained by the hand of God; for no sooner had Farel learned of his presence through Du Tillet, than he sought him out and con-

[1] JULES BONNET, *Calvin au val d'Aoste* (*Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français*, ix. p. 160).

[2] In witness of the truth of this statement, reference is made to a monument erected in the market-place at Aosta in the year 1541, which, having become weather-beaten and faded, has in modern times been repeatedly touched up (in 1741 and 1841).

jured him, as he valued his salvation, to remain in Geneva and assist in the work of Reformation. Calvin at first endeavoured to excuse himself, stating that he was desirous of quietly pursuing his studies. Then, however, Farel addressed him, prophet-like, in the following terms:—"I declare to thee on the part of God, that if thou refuse to labour with us here in God's work, He will curse thee; for in pleading thy studies as an excuse for abandoning us, thou seekest thyself more than God." Farel's words were productive of the intended effect. Calvin resolved to remain in Geneva, and in September 1536, at the age of twenty-seven, accepted the situation of teacher provisionally assigned him. After Calvin had delivered one lecture in St. Peter's Cathedral, Farel appeared before the council and petitioned that a pecuniary allowance might be made which would enable Calvin to continue his lectures; the latter also assisted Farel in preaching,[1] and was soon afterwards formally appointed pastor. Calvin's relation to Farel might be compared with the relation of Melanchthon to Luther, were it not for the fact that the relative greatness of the parties is reversed. Despite the difference in their natures, Calvin and Farel laboured together in perfect harmony. "We were one heart and one soul," Calvin himself declares. Calvin immediately took a decided stand in reference to everything relating to public morals. In this he was supported by the civil authorities. It has been shown that strict prohibitions against cursing and blaspheming, against games of chance, masquerades, dances, magnificence in dress, etc., had been issued by the Genevan Government previous to the time of which we speak, indeed as early as the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, and that Calvin, consequently, cannot be regarded as the originator of such laws. It was under his influence, how-

[1] In the minutes of the Council, under date 5th September 1536, appears the following:—"Farel a exposé que cette leçon, que ce Français donne en St. Pierre, est nécessaire." And again in February 1537: "On donne six écus d'or à Cauvin, soit Calvin, vu, qu'il n'a encore guères reçu."

ever, that these prohibitions were renewed, and enforced, it may be, with additional severity. It cannot fail to strike us, in these modern days, as strange, when we read that a dressmaker was sentenced to three days' imprisonment for excess in the ornamentation of a bride, and that, furthermore, the mother of the bride and two friends who had assisted in attiring the young woman, and had accompanied her to church, were all subjected to the same penalty. And not only to *us* must it appear strange; *Luther*, from the standpoint which *he* occupied, would also have disapproved of so rigorous a proceeding. We know how liberal his views were in regard to such matters. On another occasion, a gambler was put in the pillory, a pack of cards being hung around his neck. Justice requires, however, that we should mention, that in addition to the strict prohibitions referred to, very wholesome injunctions were issued in regard to education, among other things. Parents who did not send their children to school were fined, and if that punishment proved of no avail, their names were stricken from the list of burghers. In company with Farel, Calvin prepared an ecclesiastical constitution, which was sworn to by the burghers on the 20th November 1536, and publicly read every Sunday.

From Geneva, Calvin extended his influence over the neighbouring district of Vaud, which was then under the government of Bern. In Vaud the Reformation was not yet firmly established. The lords of Bern, who had shortly before taken possession of the territory, now consummated the Reformation with a mighty hand. On the 1st of October 1536, a disputation took place in the cathedral at Lausanne, Farel, Viret, Calvin, and a certain Peter Caroli being the speakers on the Evangelical side. A Franciscan who was present laid aside the dress of his order, declaring that thenceforth he would recognise no other head than the Lord Christ. Caroli and Viret were the first Reformed pastors of Lausanne. The academy was revived, and in the first days of the year 1537 an edict establishing the Reformation in the land of Vaud was issued from Bern.

A time of trial and conflict now arrived for Calvin. The Anabaptists gave him trouble, in the first place, but were vanquished by him in a public disputation. He next became involved in a controversy with Caroli, who was a puffed-up and contentious man. He had been a doctor of the Sorbonne, but had joined the Evangelical party in Paris, and had become acquainted with Farel and Viret. After preaching for a time in Neuchatel, he had, as was previously stated, been appointed pastor at Lausanne, together with Viret. But the old Scholastic leaven now began to work again in the late doctor of the Sorbonne. He affirmed that prayer should be offered for the dead, and that the saints should be invoked. He accused Calvin and the rest of the Genevan theologians of Arianism, because they did not attach the same value as himself to the Scholastic definitions of the doctrine of the Trinity [*Dreieinigkeit*], and avoided the use of the un-biblical expressions "person," "trinity," and the like. Caroli demanded that the Genevans should sign the three ancient œcumenical Confessions of Faith.[1] This, however, they refused to do, not because they had any quarrel with the contents of these creeds, but because they preferred not to place their necks beneath any yoke of the letter. By order of the Bernese Government, a synod was held in Lausanne, which Calvin attended. Caroli was defeated, censured as a slanderer, and compelled to leave the territories of Bern. Chagrined at his defeat, his old sympathies revived; he went to Rome and returned to the bosom of the ancient Church.

Calvin's period of conflict was, however, not yet over. A storm now arose in Geneva. There had long existed a party to which the strictness of Calvin, whose severity was shared by Farel and Courault (Corualdus), was anything but agreeable. Courault, who was a blind preacher, even surpassed

[1] The so-called Apostolic Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the so-called Athanasian Creed, all of which the Lutheran Church placed at the head of its symbolical books. In regard to the so-called Athanasian Creed (*Quicunque*), Calvin declared plainly that the ancient Church, to which it was attributed, would never have assented to it. See HENRY, i. pp. 180 and 181.

the other two in harshness. The disaffected party now sought an opportunity to vex their burdensome censors and thus to drive them to extreme measures. This opportunity was speedily found. Before the arrival of Calvin, Farel had radically done away with the traditional forms of worship. He had abolished not only the altar and images, but also the baptismal font, and had substituted ordinary leavened bread for unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper. With the exception of Sunday, as the "Lord's Day," he had stricken out all holidays from the ecclesiastical calendar—not only the days which were devoted to the commemoration of the Virgin, but also Christmas and Ascension Day. In the Bernese Church, to which the Church of Lausanne now belonged, the baptismal fonts were left standing, unleavened bread was used in the celebration of the Eucharist (as was the case in Zurich also), and besides Sunday, the feasts of the Annunciation, Christmas, and Ascension were observed. The Bernese, who desired uniformity in the usages of the churches, made their displeasure at the existing differences known to the Genevan Government, and the latter demanded that Calvin and Farel should conform to the Bernese ritual. Both preachers refused to comply with this requisition, wishing at least to wait until a synod, which was announced to meet at Zurich, should decide upon the question. Their refusal was ill received, being regarded as an instance of culpable obstinacy and disobedience to the Government. The preachers were forbidden to enter the pulpit. They, however, disregarded the prohibition, on the ground that it is right to obey God rather than man; and it must be confessed that the passionate language which they (especially Courault) made use of in the pulpit, was not always worthy of that sacred place, nor was it in any wise adapted to conciliate the hearer. Judicious men—among them some who belonged to other churches, as, for instance, Grynæus of Basel—had in vain enjoined moderation upon the indignant preachers. The people were in a state of the utmost excitement. There was raging and reviling in the

taverns. Some threatened to throw Calvin into the Rhone, and others announced their determination to shoot him. Scurrilous writings were circulated. Processions of masqueraders paraded the streets, scoffing at the Reformers and deriding, at the same time, much that was sacred. All this took place at the holy season of Easter. Farel ascended the pulpit in the church of St. Gervais, and proclaimed that under existing circumstances it would be impossible for him to celebrate the Communion, as every condition requisite for a proper participation in it was lacking, viz. faith, love, repentance. Calvin pursued the same course at St. Peter's. On the 23d of April 1538, a meeting of the citizens was held, in consequence of which the now odious preachers were commanded to leave the city within forty-eight hours. When Calvin received the decree, he remarked firmly and calmly: "Well! if we had been the servants of men, we would now be ill repaid; but we serve a great Master, who never lets those who serve Him go unrewarded, and who even pays them what He does not owe them." He left the city, accompanied by Farel. Courault had been previously imprisoned, and after his discharge was also sent into exile. Soon after the banishment of these three, Antoine Saunier, school inspector of Geneva, was also compelled to leave the city. Calvin and Farel repaired to Bern, for the purpose of complaining of the wrong which had been done them, and of vindicating their own behaviour. They again expressed their willingness to submit to the decrees of the Synod of Zurich. They also attended the Synod in person, and endeavoured to bring about an understanding in regard to the matter with which they were concerned. They even confessed that in their zeal they might occasionally have overstepped the bounds of moderation. Their statements at least made manifest the fact that it was not a spirit of obstinate persistence in their own way which had induced them to resist the commands of the Genevan Government. They had been unwilling to concede to the latter the right to impose usages of worship upon the Church.

The Bernese thereupon entered into negotiations with Geneva, in the hope of effecting a repeal of the decree in question. The hostile party, however, succeeded, at the eleventh hour, in frustrating this endeavour on the part of Bern, and the decree was adhered to. "What, then, became of the banished preachers?" it will be asked. Courault, for the few days which still remained to him on earth, was appointed pastor at Orbe. Farel, after accompanying Calvin to Basel, accepted a call to Neuchatel, where, with few interruptions, he spent the remainder of his years.[1] Calvin went from Basel to Strassburg, having, through the instrumentality of Bucer, received a call to the latter place. Like the impetuous Farel at Geneva, peace-loving Bucer pressed this call home upon Calvin when the latter hesitated to accept it, assuring him that it was a divine summons, which it would be perilous to decline, and enforcing his admonition with a reference to the prophet Jonah and his mission to Nineveh. Calvin accepted the call, and became pastor of the considerable congregation of French refugees (it is estimated that they numbered about 1500) to whom the church of St. Nicholas had been ceded. He was also speedily enabled to deliver theological lectures, the council granting him a small stipend. Here, in the "New Jerusalem," as Strassburg was called at this time, Calvin immediately became associated in friendly intimacy with Bucer, Capito, Hedio, Niger, and J. Sturm. From here he visited, as we have already seen, the religious conferences of Frankfort and Hagenau, of Worms and Regensburg, on one of which occasions he made the acquaintance of Melanchthon.[2] Thus, also, he became familiar with German theology and the circumstances of the German Church. His connection with the great teacher of Germany continued until the death of the latter, although their dispositions were very different, and Calvin could not repress the idea that Melanchthon was sometimes too yielding.

[1] He laboured for a time in Metz and its vicinity, and also spent some time among the Waldenses. He died 13th September 1565, at the age of seventy-six, after having married late in life.

[2] At the Conference of Worms.

Calvin, soon after his settlement in Strassburg, followed the example of other Reformers, and married. His heart was won by a widow, Idelette de Bures of Guelders. Her former husband, John Storder of Liege, had been an Anabaptist, but was converted from his error by Calvin. Beza speaks of this lady as a discreet and honourable woman.[1] The marriage took place in September 1540. Of this union, which lasted for only ten years, at the end of which period Calvin's wife died, one son was the only issue, and he lived but for a short time. "The Lord gave me a son," writes Calvin, "and He hath taken him away again; let them (my adversaries) regard my affliction as a disgrace, if it please them so to do. Cannot I count my sons by tens of thousands throughout the Christian world?" In like manner, Epaminondas once remarked that he would leave behind him two immortal daughters, his victories at Leuctra and Mantinea. And, in truth, in Calvin's case, it is useless for us to seek for those interesting features of a genial family life which attract us in the life of Luther. The former, grand and imposing in character, did not belong to the contracted sphere of home—he was the property of the Church; nor did he belong to a secluded provincial or national church, like Zwingle, but to the ideal Church of God, scattered throughout the world. To labour for the Church, to hazard all for her, to merge his life in hers, was his vocation. He was a Christian cosmopolitan in the noblest sense of the word. And yet, cosmopolite though he was, he did not forget his Genevan Church, to which he had first been sent in the providence of God. Even during his stay in Strassburg, he watched over it most attentively. He was in constant correspondence with the friends who had continued faithful to him, whom he exhorted not to return evil for evil, but to overcome evil with good, in obedience to the apostle's command. He at this time himself advised submission in regard to external points of worship.

Calvin did not abandon his literary labours while at Strass-

[1] *Gravis honestaque fœmina.*

burg. He prepared a second edition of the *Institutes*, placing on the title-page of the copies which were intended for France the disguised name of Alcuin. It was here also that he wrote his celebrated *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*,[1] and his treatise on the Lord's Supper; the latter work was originally written in French, and afterwards translated into Latin. Luther, who was strongly prejudiced against everything that flowed from the pen of Zwingle, expressed his satisfaction with the treatises of Calvin.[2]

Calvin's absence from Geneva had meanwhile been utilized by the Romish party in an endeavour to entice the Genevese back into the old Church. Cardinal James Sadolet, bishop of Carpentras in the county of Avignon,[3] an important dignitary in the Romish Church, and, moreover, a man of great piety and noble character, in the year 1539 addressed himself to the senate and people of Geneva in a well-written epistle, in which he strove to win his "dearly-beloved brethren in Christ" back to Rome. The council was thereby plunged in no little embarrassment. What could it oppose to the arguments of the clever rhetorician and dialectician? It was a case in which there was need of the pen of a Calvin, who alone was sufficient for such an opponent. Accordingly, the cardinal's letter was transmitted to Calvin, with the request that he would answer it. This Calvin did in a masterly manner. While he recognised the talents of his opponent, he pointed out to him that his letter contained a greater amount of dazzling rhetoric than of sound theology, and refuted his arguments with cogent reasoning. He concluded

[1] This is not the place for a particular examination into the merits of Calvin as an interpreter of Scripture. We will but remark that an important exegetical authority (Prof. E. Reuss of Strassburg) calls Calvin the greatest exegete of his century. Comp. also THOLUCK, *Litter. Anzeiger für christliche Theologen* for the year 1831.

[2] In a letter to M. Bucer, of 14th October 1539, Luther sent greetings to Sturm and Calvin, stating that he had read the writings (*libellos*) of the latter with singular pleasure (*singulari voluptate*). See DE WETTE, v. No. 1884.

[3] Comp. on Sadolet, NEUDECKER'S article in Herzog's *Realenc.* xiii. pp. 297 sqq. His letter and Calvin's answer are to be found in vol. v. of the Strassburg edition of the Reformer's works.

his reply with the desire that the Lord might open the cardinal's eyes to the true unity of the Church, as based only upon Christ, His word, and His Spirit. This answer was heartily approved by Luther, and Melanchthon was able to write to Strassburg that Calvin "was higher in favour" at Wittenberg. The Genevese now began to see more and more clearly that they stood in immediate and urgent need of the very man whom they had so shamefully banished. The storm, which had continued for some time after Calvin's departure from Geneva, was now at an end.[1] The people, or at least a large proportion of them, clamorously demanded his recall. The council therefore despatched a letter to Calvin, which he received in Worms during his attendance upon the conference there assembled. Calvin's first answer to this appeal was a declinature. "There is," he wrote to a friend, "no place in the world which I so much dread as Geneva." His consent to return was at last won by the united entreaties of Farel, Viret, and Bucer, the last of whom pled against his own interests,[2] and the representations of a formal embassy from Geneva. For a time, however, he limited the period of his promised sojourn in that city to two years. He also affixed strict conditions to his return. "If you would have me in your city," was his message to the magistrate, "you must abolish the prevailing sins of Geneva. If you are sincere in recalling me, banish the vices in company with which I cannot dwell within your walls. I cannot live in the same place with a church whose discipline is in ruins, and where audacity in evil-doing prevails unpunished. Not the pope, not tyrants who rage only outside of the Church—no! sensuality, gluttony, perjury, and the

[1] The party of the *Guillermins* (thus the adherents of Guillaume Farel were styled), and consequently of the Reformation, had vanquished the *Archichaux* (literally, Articulants, so called from the articles which they put forth). The head of the latter party, the Syndic and Captain-general Jean Philippe, had been executed in punishment of his acts of violence. Since his fall, Calvin's recall had been certain (KAMPSCHULTE, p. 365).

[2] Bucer again referred him to Jonah. The Swiss cities of Zurich, Bern, and Basel also wrote to Calvin urging his return.

like, crimes that publicly contradict my doctrine and darken the Church inwardly, are the arch-enemies of the gospel. What avails it to keep off the wolves that attack from without, if the flock be wasted and destroyed by pestilence within!"[1] On the 13th of September 1541, Calvin entered Geneva amid the acclamations of the people. The council immediately conferred with him, in the hope of gaining from him a promise of permanent abode in the city. Among other things, it presented him with cloth for a new coat. The Strassburgers, however, expressed their unwillingness to relinquish all claim to the man whom they had learned to esteem and love. Considerable negotiation was requisite for the settlement of this difficulty, which was at last terminated by the Strassburgers presenting to him the right of honorary citizenship, and proposing to continue his salary, which latter offer he declined. He now established himself in Geneva, in the dwelling assigned him in the neighbourhood of St. Peter's (*Rue des Chanoines*),[2] and again entered upon the duties of pastor and professor of theology.

[1] MÜLLER, *Reliquien*, iv. p. 114. Comp. HENRY, i. pp. 385 sqq.; STÄHELIN, i. pp. 313 sqq.

[2] Calvin's salary was fixed at 500 florins and some additional payment in produce. He received five times as much as was drawn by a syndic. This salary cannot be thought extravagant, however, even from a modern point of view, when we consider that it was necessary for him to expend much for charitable purposes, especially in the entertainment of strangers passing through Geneva; and this fact is alleged as the motive for so large an allowance in the protocol of the council.

CHAPTER XXXII.

CALVIN'S SECOND APPEARANCE AT GENEVA — ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE AND DIVINE WORSHIP — ORDINANCES — CONTROVERSY WITH SEBASTIAN CASTELLIO—THE LIBERTINES (AMEAUX, PERRIN, GRUET)—CONTROVERSY WITH BOLSEC—MICHAEL SERVETUS, HIS TRIAL AND EXECUTION—REFLECTIONS ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AGAINST HERETICS—SUBSEQUENT CONFLICTS OF CALVIN—BERTHELIER—FOUNDING OF THE ACADEMY—CALVIN'S LAST DAYS—HIS SICKNESS, DEATH, AND BURIAL.

CALVIN'S proceedings at Geneva have been variously apprehended and represented. He has been called the "Lycurgus of Geneva;" he has been compared to a Roman dictator, to a pope such as Gregory VII. or Innocent III., and even to an oriental caliph.[1] An influence over the Genevan Government has been ascribed to him that would cause the latter to appear as the mere tool of his hierarchical passion. According to some accounts, it would seem that, like the Olympian Jupiter, he had merely to nod, and the whole earth trembled. Such exaggerated statements have been reduced to their proper level by modern investigation.[2] It has been proved that not only in political affairs, but even in ecclesiastical matters, the civil authorities of Geneva insisted jealously upon their rights, and reserved to themselves the

[1] MAIMBOURG, *Histoire du Calvinisme*, i. p. 114.

[2] AMÉDÉE ROGET, *L'église et l'état à Genève du vivant de Calvin, étude d'histoire politico-ecclésiastique*, Geneva, 1867 (also in the *Bibliothèque universelle* of 1865). Comp. also HUNDESHAGEN, *Ueber den Einfluss des Calvinismus auf die Ideen von Staat und staatsbürgerlicher Freiheit*, Bern, 1842.

prerogative of final decision; and that there were not lacking instances when their opinions conflicted with those of the Consistory. It is a fact, nevertheless, that a theocracy—not in the Roman Catholic, but in the old biblical sense of the word—was one of Calvin's ideals, one which he endeavoured to realize by all the means that he regarded as legitimate. What he desired above all things to promote was, not his own glory, not the glory of the priestly individual or class, but the glory of God. In the entertainment of this theocratic longing, he sympathized with the world-historic ideas of the better popes of the Middle Ages, though with a difference, as we have already intimated. And thus, aiming too high, at an object which from its very nature is unattainable for humanity, it happened that Calvin, like the popes to whom we have referred, in the choice of means frequently overstepped the bounds of sagacious secular policy as well as of judicious theology.

We have already demonstrated the fact that Calvin himself entertained exalted ideas of his mission, that he felt himself to be called by God and placed by Him in those situations which he filled. He compared himself not merely to minor prophets, such as Jonah, but also to David, the great prophet-king; for as the latter was called away from his flock to the highest dignity which the kingdom afforded, in like manner, Calvin felt, did God draw *him* forth from indigence and obscurity, and entrust him with the honourable office of a herald and minister of the gospel.[1] And who can wonder that he recognised the higher hand of God in his recall to Geneva after so many conflicts? Nay, more, must not this unquestioning faith in his higher mission be regarded as the determinative principle of all his subsequent actions? As part of his welcome to Geneva, there was a general celebration of the Lord's Supper—a feast of reconciliation, as it were. Days of repentance and prayer were set apart in every week for the invocation of the help and favour of God upon Geneva

[1] See the preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms*; comp. KAMPSCHULTE, p. 221.

and its church. Agreeably to Calvin's wishes, a strict ecclesiastical and moral discipline now began to be exercised by the Consistory. Cursing, swearing, drinking, neglect of attendance upon the public worship of God, dancing and other amusements, among them some that are now universally regarded as innocent, were severely censured. If, notwithstanding this, there were some who engaged in any of the misdemeanours above mentioned, such offenders were excluded from the Lord's Supper; no civil penalty, however, was inflicted upon them. The ordinances of divine worship were regulated. There was preaching in every church twice on Sunday;[1] the arrangement, however, was such that the pastors circulated in the different churches, as the whole city constituted but one congregation—a custom which was retained in Geneva till the present day.[2] It was directed that the Lord's Supper should be celebrated four times during the year—on Easter-day, Whitsunday, Christmas (or rather on the Sunday nearest to Christmas, that day not being observed as a special festival), and on the first Sunday in September. Children were not admitted to the Lord's Supper, but were obliged to attend upon the course of instruction specially designed for them until the time of their admission to the Eucharist. Instruction was imparted to the children during the noon hour on every Sunday. Calvin, who previously had written a catechism in a dogmatical form, now issued a second, different from the first, being arranged in questions and answers. This catechism has not the genial and artless simplicity of either the Lutheran or the Œcolampadian catechism, but, like everything else which flowed from the pen of Calvin, it is remarkable for its theological thoroughness and solidity.[3] The form of worship observed in the Genevese

[1] Preaching was, however, not confined to Sundays. Numerous sermons were delivered during the week, and there was no day on which public worship was not celebrated.

[2] BUNGENER, p. 209.

[3] Both catechisms, and also the liturgy (*Forme des prières ecclésiastiques*), are to be found in vols. v. and vi. of the new edition of Calvin's works.

Church, with all its simplicity,—nay, on account of that very quality,—was solemn and impressive. It had the appearance of proceeding from a congregation of Christians permeated and upborne by the pure truth of the divine word, and needing no external incentive to devote themselves whole-heartedly to the service of the living God. The standing prayer was of a penitential character; in some of the Reformed churches it is still used every Sunday, and is to be found in their service-books. The singing, which was restricted to the time preceding and immediately subsequent to the sermon, was conducted with solemn monotony, in heavy, long-drawn notes. The Psalms constituted the only material for this part of the service. In this particular, the Genevese Church presented a striking contrast to the Lutheran Church, with its wealth and variety of song.

The prescripts relating to divine worship were, however, not confined to the public celebration thereof in the sanctuary. It was intended that every house should be a house of prayer, a church in miniature, a household of God. The ministers, who were chosen by the churches, composed, in their totality, the "Venerable Company" (*Vénérable Compagnie*). It was their duty, in conjunction with the elders, diligently to visit every house, and, when it seemed necessary, to examine the inmates in the catechism, and to investigate the religious and moral condition of families generally. Distinct from the Venerable Company was the Consistory, a court composed of the clergy and lay elders, whose duty it was energetically to execute ecclesiastical discipline. The work of this body Calvin regarded as the veritable sinew and essential substance of ecclesiastical life.

On the 9th of November 1541, the "Ecclesiastical Ordinances" were ratified by the Council of Two Hundred, and on the 20th of the same month were adopted by the people without any objection. Finally, on the 2d of January 1542, the ecclesiastical fundamental law of the state was most solemnly proclaimed to the people, who had been

assembled by the blowing of trumpets and the pealing of the great bell. The execution of the law led, it is true, to fresh difficulties and complications, which it is not our purpose to discuss. Earnestly as Calvin at first strove after moderation in his personal conduct,—and that he did thus strive, even his opponents must acknowledge,— although he laid all possible restraint upon himself, doing violence, in many respects, to his own nature, and besought of God the gift of gentleness and patience, a number of unpleasant encounters ensued. Persons who objected to sacrificing their independence of thought and action, and who were not ready to adhere in every particular to Calvin and his programme of reform, easily incurred peril of expulsion from the city as disturbers of the public order, if haply they escaped severer punishment. Proceedings were instituted against a number of individuals, who were made to experience the punitive severity of "Master Calvin" and "the seigniors of the Consistory."

Among these sufferers we mention first Sebastian Castellio (Chatillon, or really Chateillon).[1] He was born in the year 1515, in Savoy according to some accounts, while others mention Dauphiny as his birth-place.[2] His parents were poor but honest people.[3] Sebastian was possessed of unusual gifts, and, in particular, of an extraordinary facility in acquiring languages. He studied in Lyons at first, and afterwards at Strassburg, at which place he was for a time an inmate of the same house with Calvin. Through the influence of the latter, he obtained the position of regent of the College at Geneva. He was an out-and-out philologist, even in his study of theology, and was unable to elevate himself to the grand views of Calvin. He met the speculative dogmatism of the latter

[1] In allusion to the Castalian spring, he delighted to call himself Castallio. (Comp. J. MÄHLY (1862).

[2] MÄHLY decides in favour of the latter place (p. 7). He derives from authentic documents the information that his birth-place was not Chatillon en Bresse, as is generally asserted, but Martin du Fresne, half a mile from Nantua.

[3] A favourite proverb in his father's house was, "On rendre, on pendre, on les peines d'enfer attendre."

with a simple and prosaic criticism that was quick to fasten upon details. Neither could Castellio accept the allegorical interpretation of the Song of Solomon, by which the love relations set forth in the Canticle are viewed as a mystical glorification of Christ and His relation to the Church. The philological Humanist beheld nothing in this inspired book save an erotic poem in the oriental style. And even from this human point of view he had no appreciation whatever of the tender beauties of the poem. He regarded it as "a carnal love-song," as Hottinger expresses it, or, as Calvin tells us, as an obscene and lascivious poem, in which Solomon gave expression to his impure love.[1] He therefore desired to have it expunged from the canon of the sacred writings.[1] Such an inconsiderate criticism and condemnation of a biblical book necessarily and justly excited indignation. In dogmatical things, also, the pedagogue ventured to differ from Calvin in opinion. Thus it was in the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell. Calvin's doctrine of election—a doctrine which has offended others beside Castellio—was the one with which he had least sympathy. Notwithstanding these differences, he believed himself warranted in using the good gifts with which God had endowed him in endeavouring to promote the glory of God. His philological ability was of advantage to him in his translations of the Bible into Latin and French. In his Latin translation he strove chiefly after an elegant and classical diction—a style which would at the same time be acceptable to the reading world of that day, and which would also recommend itself to the wits of the period. By the avoidance of so-called Hebraisms, however, much that is in the highest degree characteristic of the Bible was in great measure deprived of its force. The element of foreboding and mystery was lost in a language which conformed too perfectly to the speech of everyday life.[2] Castellio sent

[1] "Carmen obscœnum et lascivum, quo Salomo impudicos suos amores descripserit."

[2] Similar remarks will apply to Castellio's translation of the Bible into French,

proofs of this translation to Calvin; the latter expressed himself dissatisfied with the work, and afterwards, when the Bible actually appeared, the Genevan clergy spoke of it in terms of abhorrence. In addition to all this, the schoolmaster ventured on one occasion, in a discourse which he delivered before a meeting of the clergy, to contrast the Apostle Paul and the preachers of the gospel at Geneva, thereby causing the latter to appear in anything but an advantageous light, and giving offence to many. Altogether, Calvin and his adherents considered that there were sufficient reasons to justify them in getting rid of so burdensome a man. Although he was not formally deprived of his situation, it was intimated to him, plainly enough, that his removal was desired, and admission to the ministry, which he had applied for, was denied him. On his withdrawal from the College, Calvin, in the name of the Genevan clergy, presented him with a testimonial, commendatory of his moral conduct and his high qualifications for educational service; the Reformer could not refrain, however, from referring to Castellio's theological heresies.[1] Castellio, having thus lost his office, found it necessary to leave Geneva. Accompanied by his wife, four sons, and four daughters, he repaired to Basel, where, with the assistance of the noble bookseller Oporin, he contrived to gain a scanty subsistence.[2] Finally, in 1553, he was appoined professor in ordinary of the Greek language at Basel.

in which, for instance, he changes *la cène du Seigneur* into *le souper*, etc. Castellio was the forerunner of the modern translators of the Bible, a class which has had its representatives in Germany as well as elsewhere.

[1] It may be mentioned, as a characteristic incident, that when, at the time of the plague (1543), most of the Genevese clergy held back from service at the hospital, Castellio volunteered to visit the sick who were there, but his offer was declined (whether on account of his heterodoxy or not, is not stated). See KAMPSCHULTE, p. 685; MÄHLY, p. 16. According to STÄHELIN, p. 367, and others, Castellio's withdrawal from Geneva was voluntary.

[2] In company with other poor people he was sometimes occupied in drawing the driftwood, that floated into the Rhine from the Birs, out of the water, and selling it to the Government for a small sum. His opponents thereupon accused him of theft, and Castellio found it necessary publicly to vindicate himself from this charge.

But the most serious contest in which Calvin became involved was waged against the party by him styled Libertines. Who, it may be asked, were these?—a question which is susceptible of different answers. If, on the one hand, we credit exclusively the declarations of Calvin and his adherents, they were persons who resembled the old "Spirituals" of the Middle Ages; who, like some fanatics in Germany, used the word "spirit" improperly, and, under the pretence of spiritualizing Christianity, robbed it of its positive substance—being, in fact, disguised Pantheists and Indifferentists.[1] Possibly, such sentiments were accompanied by a corresponding life, which spurned the restraints of the law, and practically advocated the emancipation of the flesh. On the other hand, if we regard others, whose testimony is not to be rejected, and who, especially in modern times, have established themselves on the basis of an unprejudiced investigation of history, we find this odious name to have been conferred also upon a party which was opposed in general to the unlimited authority of Calvin, and which, from its attachment to the Geneva of former days and the habits and customs thereof, strove in particular to resist the French influence. According to this view of the subject, the Libertines would correspond to the old "Confederates" [*Eidgenossen*], who formerly resisted the rule of the Mamelukes, and who at this time did not deny their Protestant sentiments, but whose Protestantism was not of the Calvinistic type. A distinction between religious and political Libertines has also been made.[2] Time may elucidate this whole subject still further. It may, however, already be assumed with sufficient certainty, that in the opposition formed against Calvin, there was a mingling of very different elements, some being of a noble, and others of a baser character. Instances of a

[1] The latter also appeared under the name of Nicodemites, a party which maintained that a man might be an Evangelical at heart and yet outwardly profess the Catholic religion, just as Nicodemus was a *secret* adherent of the Lord. These, also, were opposed by Calvin.

[2] See HERZOG, title "Calvin," *Realenc.* ii. p. 520; comp. also TRECHSEL, title "Libertiner," viii. pp. 375 sqq.

similar sort have been found in all ages. In any case, Calvin's position was a difficult one, and all his greatness and Christian heroism were requisite to enable him to maintain his stand like a rock on which the surges dash and break. True, he exhibited his human fallibility by occasionally resorting to measures which we of the present day can scarcely reconcile with the fundamental Christian principles of his character, and far be it from us to deny that such was the fact. As has frequently been the case, however, in all ages of the world, the unbridled masses of the godless required no other reason for delighting to abuse so conspicuous a man, than that they found his moral greatness oppressive, his life of faith a vexation and folly, and his whole character and conduct a thorn in the flesh. These contemptible enemies of Calvin even went to the length of naming their dogs after the hated minister, besides perpetrating a variety of similar outrages. We will now proceed to a nearer view of other individuals with whom Calvin became involved in conflicts.

Pierre Ameaux was, at the time of Calvin's rule in Geneva, a member of the Council of Two Hundred, of the smaller Council of Sixty, and of the Council of State, a captain of artillery, and governor of the military munitions of the city. By occupation he was a manufacturer of playing-cards. He had professed adherence to the tenets of the Anabaptists. His wife having for some offence been condemned to a few days' imprisonment, Ameaux indulged in all manner of invectives against Calvin, calling him, for instance, a second pope and a tyrant. He was fined sixty thalers. Nor was Calvin content with this punishment. He demanded that Ameaux should make him the *amende honorable*, which was performed by the culprit, clad in the shirt of a penitent and holding in his hand a burning torch, kneeling before the person whom he had offended and thus craving his pardon. This treatment of Ameaux occasioned much commotion among the people, and some stormy scenes ensued, which it is not our purpose to enlarge upon.[1]

[1] See STÄHELIN, i. p. 392.

Ami Perrin, captain-general (commandant) of the city, was one of the men who had been instrumental in procuring the recall of Calvin, but who were afterwards unwilling to submit to his ecclesiastical discipline. Like Ameaux, he had a bad wife, a daughter of old Favre, who was himself one of Calvin's sworn enemies. This woman is described as "a perfect fury," capable of hurling all possible insults at Calvin. She, too, was punished with imprisonment. The day succeeding that on which she was condemned, Calvin found upon his pulpit a paper in which he and his colleagues were threatened with death. This paper contained also some accusations of a political nature, charging Calvin with desiring to betray Geneva to France.[1] Perrin was banished and his effigy was hanged on the gallows.

Jacques Gruet was descended from a good family, and had formerly been a canon. Heavy charges were brought against him. He was accused not only of personal invectives against Calvin, although these also were laid to his charge, but, moreover, of outrageous blasphemies against the Founder of Christianity. In the summer of 1547 he had, by a public notice, threatened Calvin and his associates with death, alleging that it was wrong for the whole city to obey one melancholy man who was endeavouring to deprive the people of every pleasure. He had called Calvin a pope and a hypocrite. Similar insults were contained in a note which he laid upon the pulpit of the Reformer. Nor was this all. In a book, which was not, indeed, discovered until after the death of Gruet (he having concealed it under the roof of his house), he called Christ a deceiver. A criminal process was instituted against this man. For a month he was subjected to torture, and on the 26th of June he died on the scaffold. The motives assigned for this severe sentence were not only

[1] On these processes comp. GALIFFE, *Quelques pages d'histoire exacte soit les procès criminels intentés à Genève en* 1547 *pour haute trahison contre Ami Perrin, ancien syndic, conseiller, et capitaine-général de la république, et contre son accusateur Laurent Maigret, dit le Magnifique*, etc., 1862.

that he had spoken contemptuously of religion, that he had professed disregard for divine and human laws and styled them a work of human caprice, and that he had wished to overthrow the institutions of the Church, but also that he had spoken ill of Calvin and his colleagues in the ministry. The blasphemous book above referred to, having been discovered in the place of its concealment, was burned by the public executioner.

"In the commencement of the sixth decade of the century, Calvin became involved in a vexatious conflict with Jerome Bolsec, formerly a Carmelite monk. A fugitive from the court of Ferrara in Italy, he had taken refuge at Geneva, where he turned his knowledge of medicine to account by practising as a physician. He believed himself called upon to oppose Calvin's doctrine of unconditional election, which he accordingly did with all possible decision. He laid before the Consistory a paper in which he declared the above-mentioned doctrine to be an error, and one more injurious than the errors of Papistry. The Consistory informed him that he must either abstain from meddling with theology and devote himself to his profession, or leave the city. Bolsec withdrew to Vevay (in the territory of Vaud), and thence continued his polemics. The Lausanne theologians, Viret and Beza, endeavoured to put a stop to his proceedings. A provincial synod of Vaud announced to him that it would no longer endure his "confusing nonsense." He thereupon returned to Geneva. Calvin's enemies now stationed themselves at his back and encouraged him to attack the Reformer. On the 16th of October 1551, Bolsec attended the service of the congregation, in which, after the close of the sermon, every one present was at liberty to make some remarks. André Jusey preached, in agreement with Calvin's views, on the eighth chapter of John. Calvin himself was there, but not in his accustomed place, so that Bolsec thought him absent, and began accordingly to attack him in the most violent manner. He declared that there was nothing more impious and absurd than the doctrine of election; that

any person who professed it, made God the author of sin and a very tyrant, taking pleasure in damning His creatures. He even boldly affirmed that Augustine knew nothing of this doctrine, and that it was invented by Laurentius Valla (in the fourteenth century), thus exposing his gross ignorance. Calvin at this juncture emerged from his concealment, to the great terror of the speaker. It was easy for the Reformer to refute the statements of his opponent. Bolsec, who had nothing to reply, was arrested in the church, removed to prison, and at length banished from Geneva, being threatened with a cudgelling if he were ever found again on Genevan soil. The opinion of the other Swiss churches had been sought before the last measure was taken, as Bolsec had asserted that they were on his side. Such, indeed, was not the case; they, however, disapproved of the manner in which he was treated. The Bernese had at first espoused the cause of Bolsec; but Calvin wrote them a letter, in which he painted the erroneous teachings of the man in the darkest colours, and called him a deceiver, a faithless scoundrel, a destructive pest. Bolsec found an ally in the exiled Castellio. By this conflict with Bolsec, Calvin was induced to publish a special treatise on his doctrine on election of grace, already set forth less in detail in his *Institutes*.[1] Twenty-six years later, thirteen years after Calvin's death, Bolsec took a mean revenge on the author of his banishment, by composing a libellous tractate, full of the most venomous calumnies against Calvin.[2]

But of all the controversial acts in Calvin's life, the one which has always excited the greatest interest is the process of Servetus. Michael Servetus (Servede),[3] by birth a Spaniard, of the province of Aragon, was by profession a physician,

[1] The treatise referred to is *De æterna Dei prædestinatione*.

[2] *De la vie, mœurs, actes, doctrine, et mort de Jean Calvin.* He accused Calvin of the most contemptible vices, and declared that he had once been branded and horse-whipped for an infamous crime, etc. And to this day certain historians turn to this sewer of lies as a fountain of truth.

[3] TRECHSEL, *Geschichte der Antitrinitarier: I. Michael Servet und seine Vorgänger*, Heidelberg, 1839; and HERZOG'S *Realenc.* xiv. pp. 286 sqq.

though he was also skilled in jurisprudence, and had, moreover, taken part in the religious movement of the age. He had met with Calvin as a theological opponent at Paris, and had been challenged by him to a disputation. Servetus, however, failed to make his appearance, and went to Vienne instead. Calvin is reported (by his adversaries) to have given the government of that place information against him as a teacher of erroneous doctrine. This Calvin denied, affirming at the same time, that even if he *had* thus acted, he would have been guilty of nothing wrong. Servetus was imprisoned at Vienne, but made his escape in April 1553. He proceeded to Geneva. What he sought there, whether or not he desired to ally himself with the Libertines, is a question that we shall not attempt to decide. For four weeks he succeeded in concealing himself, but at the end of that period Calvin discovered him. The council was immediately informed of his presence. Nicholas de Fontaines, a Frenchman, and Calvin's amanuensis, appeared as complainant against Servetus, who, on the 13th of August 1553, was committed to prison, together, as the law required, with his accuser. The charge against Servetus consisted of thirty-eight articles, setting forth dangerous errors alleged to be maintained by him. A slight consideration of these errors is requisite.

According to Beza's description of Servetus, the latter was a monster, compounded of all possible disgusting and extravagant heresies.[1] Modern investigation has furnished us with a less terrific picture of him. It has been said that Servetus denied the divinity of Christ, that he regarded Jesus of Nazareth as a mere man. But this, also, is incorrect. Servetus, if we may believe his own statements, beheld in Christ the Son of God. Nay, more, he did not deny that the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ. That which, however, he did most positively disaffirm was, that the Son of God, Jesus Christ, had, like the Father, existed from eternity

[1] "Monstrum ex omnibus quantumvis rancidis et portentosis hæresibus conflatum."

as a Person distinct from the Father. The Logos (the Word) he did not regard as identical with the personal Christ. He thus, undoubtedly, combated the doctrine of the Trinity as formulated by the Church, and in this respect adhered to the opinions of Sabellius and Photinus,[1]—opinions condemned by the ancient Church, it is true, but which, in modern times, have received more lenient judgment. It cannot be denied that the idea of a divinity filling the man (Jesus) had a pantheistic background, nor that the heterodoxy of Servetus appeared in more than a single instance; in fact, it must be admitted that his whole way of thinking contained something that might have been perilous to the entire doctrinal system of the Reformation. There was, moreover, in the personal character of the man something that repelled confidence,—a restless, defiant, and sarcastic element. Many of his utterances must necessarily have been offensive to a pious mind; as, for instance, his comparison of the ecclesiastical Trinity to the three-headed dog Cerberus, or his pantheistic declaration, during his examination, that the pavement upon which he stood was itself God. But however frightful may be our conception of the man and his doctrine (though we cannot fail to perceive some deep religious traits in his character), the whole course of procedure against him will fill us with still greater abhorrence, if we attempt to judge it by the standard of modern humanity. We must, however, consider the whole affair in connection with the age in which it occurred, and the ideas then prevalent. It will readily be understood that Calvin exerted himself to the utmost to lead the erring man to another way of thinking, even visiting him in his dungeon. But Servetus experienced a feeling of repulsion when in the presence of Calvin. He said without disguise that Calvin was a second Simon Magus, and deserved the fate that was in preparation for himself. Calvin, on the other hand, regarded the doctrine of Servetus as nothing but a system of confused dreams. Infant baptism was among the points combated by

[1] Comp. the author's *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. pp. 241 sqq., 450.

Servetus, and we know how severe were the measures employed against Anabaptists elsewhere. Can it, then, be any matter of surprise to us that, as early as the 23d of August, the Procurator-General proposed the infliction of capital punishment upon Servetus? Before deciding the case, however, the opinion of other Swiss churches was sought. Bullinger, in the name of the people of Zürich, characterised the doctrine of Servetus as thoroughly heretical and highly culpable, but expressed a willingness to leave the determination of the punishment to be endured by the offender to the discretion of the Genevese Council. Switzerland, he believed, was in duty bound to clear herself in the eyes of other nations from all suspicion of heresy, and no more favourable opportunity for so doing could be afforded than the present. The people of Schaffhausen concurred in opinion with those of Zurich. The Bernese expressed themselves with singular sharpness. Haller declared that he doubted not for an instant that if Servetus were in Bern, short work would be made with him, and he would be condemned to the fire without ceremony.[1] The people of Basel (under *Antistes* Simon Sulzer) were more lenient in their opinion. They advised that every possible effort should first be made to convert the erring man; if such endeavours proved of no avail, they agreed that he should be incapacitated from doing further harm. At Geneva itself, Perrin hoped to rescue Servetus by bringing the process before the Council of Two Hundred, among whose members were many opponents of Calvin; the effort to submit the case to that council was, however, unsuccessful. Calvin was convinced that Servetus was worthy of death, but advised that his execution should be by the sword, not by fire. On the 21st of October the Council of State, united with the great Council of Sixty, came to a decision, and on the 26th of October their sentence was formally proclaimed; it was to the

[1] A few years later (1566), the anti-Trinitarian, Valentine Gentilis, was actually beheaded at Bern; and in 1529, Konrad had suffered the same punishment at Basel.

effect that Servetus should be conducted to the Place Champel (a slight eminence within twenty minutes' walk of Geneva), that he should there be bound to a stake and burned to ashes, together with his two books,[1] as a terrific example to all who might be inclined to imitate his course. Servetus had not expected such a sentence. He was deeply moved on hearing it, and at first broke into loud sobs and groans. He soon, however, regained his composure. Farel, who was in Geneva at the time, was commissioned to prepare him for his end. The first condition submitted to him was that he should revoke his error. This demand occasioned fresh controversy. Servetus required scriptural proofs of the erroneousness of his doctrine, and refused to be satisfied by those furnished by Farel. He demanded that a passage should be shown him setting forth Christ, as a personality distinct from the Father, existing, antecedent to His birth, as the Son of God. Such a passage could not be found. In regard to the relation of the accused to Calvin, Servetus was willing to beg the Reformer's pardon; but he stedfastly refused to recant. When his sentence was read to him at the council-house, he entreated that it might be mitigated to death by the sword. But even this melancholy boon was denied him. He solemnly affirmed that if he had erred, it had been through ignorance and with the idea that he was promoting the glory of God. He was conducted to the place of execution. When again and again he ejaculated, "O God, my God!" Farel asked him if he could find nothing better to say than that. It is expressly stated by the chroniclers of this sad event, that Servetus refrained from all blasphemy on his way to the stake. Before the execution, Farel exhorted the surrounding multitude to let the miserable man, whose sufferings they were about to witness, serve them as a warning of the extent to which Satan can mislead a man, however great his intellectual gifts may be. The torch was then applied to the pile. In constructing the latter, green wood had been employed, which refused to burn, and it was necessary to throw burning faggots on the unfortunate

[1] *De Trinitatis Erroribus* and *De Restitutione Christianismi.*

man.[1] From the midst of the flames he was heard to cry, "*Jesus, Thou Son of the Eternal God,* have mercy upon me!" This failed to satisfy the scrupulous orthodoxy of his opponents, who demanded that he should say, "*Jesus, Thou Eternal Son of God.*" Thus Servetus ended his life at the stake on the 27th of October 1553.

Even at that period, there was a division of sentiment in regard to the execution of Servetus. We have already seen that the orthodox leaders of other Swiss churches entertained the same views as Calvin and the Genevese. Those who themselves had experienced the severity of Calvin thought differently. Bolsec's party revived, and launched forth into invectives against Calvin. Many declared that a new pope and a new inquisition had arisen. Calvin was compelled to publish a vindication of his conduct.[2] In the month of March there appeared, in the interests of the opposite party, a publication ostensibly printed at Magdeburg (but in reality from the press of Basel), professing to come from the pen of Martin Bellius. This individual was, doubtless, none other than Sebastian Castellio, who had, for the purpose of composing the libel, associated himself with others, possibly with Martin Borrhaus, Lælius Socinus, and Secundus Curio. The book was dedicated to Duke Christopher of Wurtemberg. Without mention being made of the process of Servetus, the tractate, in general terms and with citations from weighty authorities, denied to magistrates the right of inflicting capital punishment upon heretics. The publication called forth a reply from Theodore Beza in defence of Calvin and the principles adhered to by that Reformer.[3] "If it be both the right and the duty of the State"—this was the logic of the orthodoxy

[1] This is according to the one-sided reports of Calvin's opponents.

[2] *Fidelis expositio errorum Michælis Serveti et brevis eorundem refutatio, ubi docetur, jure gladii hæreticos esse coercendos,* 1554. This writing was signed by fifteen ministers of the city of Geneva.

[3] To the tractate, *De non puniendis gladio hæreticis* (of this publication an abstract is given by Mahly, pp. 38 sqq.), Beza replied by a treatise, entitled, *De hæreticis a civili magistratu puniendis.* The latter was translated into French in 1560.

of the age—"to inflict death as a punishment for murder, adultery, theft, etc., crimes which affect only temporal possessions, how much more is it incumbent upon the civil authority to take up arms against heresy, which kindles a fire that can be quenched only with the everlasting burning of many thousands!" And such principles were assented to even by Melanchthon, a man who was in other respects so pacific and yielding.[1] We doubt whether Luther would have given them his approval, especially when we call to mind that saying of his, that "heresy is a spiritual thing, that cannot be hewn with any axe, or burned with any fire, or drowned with any water."

Be the matter twisted and turned as it may, the burning of Servetus will ever remain a dark spot on the history of the Reformation, and in the life of Calvin. We must not, however, charge on Calvin the whole odium of an act in which he was supported by the age in which he lived, or at least by a large proportion of its representative men. How many Anabaptists were beheaded and drowned in the age of the Reformation, whom no one ever thinks of mentioning! Why is it that the execution of Servetus alone is always harped upon as a misdeed of Calvin's? Possibly, because the horrible manner of his death serves, more than any other, to recall the horrors of the Inquisition, and the executions of Huss and Savonarola. And moreover, Calvin's personal participation in the details of the process appears in a manner so conspicuous as to enable us to understand how the antipathy of later generations to such bloody judgments upon heretics became connected, more closely than is consistent with justice, with a previously-existent antipathy to the harsh and awe-inspiring character of the Genevese Reformer.

In view of the unjust censure thus heaped upon Calvin, it

[1] Melanchthon wrote to Calvin, under date 14th October 1554, as follows:—"I thoroughly approve the action of your magistrates in putting such a blasphemer to death, in accordance with the sentence pronounced upon him, and also in accordance with justice" (*Corp. Ref.* viii. p. 362; comp. p. 250).

is more than ever our duty, as lovers of impartial history, to turn now from the bloody scene of Servetus' execution and gather the most important remaining particulars of the rich and, in many respects, blessed labours of the great Reformer. We must first seek him once more upon the field of battle. The Libertines continued to give him much trouble. Perrin, once banished, had (as will have been inferred from an account of the trial of Servetus) returned to the city, where (since 1553) he had again been discharging the office of syndic. Berthelier, son of the Berthelier who had been executed in former political disturbances at Geneva, became one of the chiefs of the Libertines. Being excommunicated by the Consistory, he complained to the Government. The latter commanded the Consistory to abrogate its sentence of excommunication, a requirement which the Consistory refused to comply with. The Government then itself laid hold upon the spiritual authority, discharged Berthelier from the ban, and furnished him with a letter of absolution, to which the seal of the city was affixed. Calvin protested against this procedure, and continued to debar Berthelier from the Lord's Supper. From the pulpit he declared: "I will suffer death sooner than with my own hand give the holy of the Lord to such convicted despisers of God." These words produced so great an impression that a disturbance was apprehended. The syndic privately intimated to Berthelier that, in order to prevent any disturbance, it would be well for him to absent himself from the table of the Lord. In the afternoon Calvin again ascended the pulpit, and warned the congregation that he might soon be taken away from them. He declared that he had no desire to fight against the Government, but exhorted them to stand firm in the faith, and, in the words of the apostle, commended them to God and to the work of His grace. The discourse produced a powerful impression. The council became aware of the impropriety of its action and revoked the decree of absolution. The opinions of the other Swiss churches, sought for in this case also, were all in favour

of Calvin. Perrin still refused to relinquish all hope of success in the cause which he had espoused, but he and Berthelier were finally obliged to leave the city.

This was the last external struggle in which the Reformer was engaged previous to the close of the year (1555) which we regard as terminating the epoch of the Reformation.

We shall continue our narrative of Calvin's life to its end, however. An event which had an important bearing upon the ecclesiastical and scientific interests of Geneva was the founding of the academy in 1558. This institution was primarily designed for the education of theologians. Calvin would gladly have expanded it into a University, but for this the pecuniary resources of the little state of Geneva were inadequate. On the 5th of June 1559, the academy was opened with great solemnity. Theodore Beza was its first rector.[1] In the very first year after its foundation, nine hundred men, from almost all the nations of Europe, entered their names upon the rolls of the institution. The influence which Calvin exerted over foreign countries will appear in my history of the Church in other lands. His correspondence was immense and extended in all directions. His industry was marvellous. To be condemned to idleness, as he occasionally was when sickness interfered with his labours, was most painful to him. His incessant mental exertions, combined with the constant nervous excitement which he was compelled to undergo, at length consumed his physical strength. He frequently suffered from fever, gout, cough, and asthma—troubles which at the last increased so distressingly that he went to the pulpit from his bed, and returned to the latter immediately after the close of service. He was at last obliged to permit himself to be either carried or supported to his lecture-room. He began the exposition of Ezekiel in 1563, but was unable to complete it. Exhausted with labour and borne down by sickness, he longed for repose. On the 6th of February 1564, he preached his last sermon, being

[1] For particulars, see STÄHELIN, i. pp. 485 sqq.

much hindered by coughing and blood-spitting. He was often heard to exclaim amid his pain, "How long, O Lord?" He daily occupied himself with the Holy Scriptures. On the 10th of March the council directed that public prayer should be made for his continuance in life. As Œcolampadius had done, Calvin, on the 24th of March, assembled the ministers of the Church about him. On the 27th he had himself carried to the council-house, tottered up the steps of the building, entered the hall, removed his cap, and thanked the assembled council for the benefits which they had conferred upon him and the good-will manifested toward him. On a subsequent occasion, in April, when a deputation from the council visited him on his sick-bed,[1] he recommended to the "mighty seigniors" (*magnifiques seigneurs*), as he called them, the exercise of firmness and perseverance, with hope in Him who calleth the dead back to life. He concluded his advice with the following words of warning:—"If you desire that this commonwealth should continue, take care that the seat of authority in which God has placed you be not defiled: for He is the eternal and most high God, the King of kings, the Lord of lords, who will put honour upon them that honour Him, and will overthrow them that despise Him."

On the 2d of April (Easter-day), he caused himself to be carried to church on a litter, listened to the sermon, and received the sacrament from the hand of Beza. With a trembling voice he joined in the singing of the last psalm. On the 24th he drew up his will. His whole disposable property, which fell to his nephews and nieces, consisted of 225 thalers. He had never striven after wealth—had refused many presents. He, however, accepted with gratitude among other gifts some old wine, which the council sent him for his strengthening, because "he had none that was good." Even his enemies bore witness to his disinterested and unselfish spirit. Pope Pius IV. said that the strength of this heretic consisted in the

[1] For further particulars concerning Calvin's last hours, see STÄHELIN, ii. pp. 450 sqq.; and HENRY, iii. chap. ii. pp. 574 sqq.

fact that money had no power over him. When Cardinal Sadolet wished to visit him in Geneva, he expected to find him in such a palace as a Romish bishop would have occupied, and was exceedingly surprised at the modest parsonage to which he was directed.

On the 28th of April, Calvin again summoned the clergy to his side. He sent Farel a letter of farewell on the 2d of May. Although Calvin charged his old friend not to come to him, Farel at once hastened to Geneva to take leave of the Reformer in person. Calvin spent the rest of his days in prayer, yet the door of his sick-room was always open to any who desired to enter. On the 19th of May (before Whitsuntide) the clergy assembled at his house to partake of a love-feast. From this the sick man was obliged to permit himself to be carried away and laid upon his bed, which he never left again. Only a wall divided him from his colleagues, who sat for some time expectant of his end. He died at about eight o'clock in the evening of the 27th of May. "At the moment when the sun went down," says Beza, "the greatest light that ever shone for the benefit of God's Church on earth returned to heaven." Calvin retained his consciousness to his last breath. There was great and general mourning over his departure; Bullinger's grief was most profound. On the day following that on which Calvin died, his body, enclosed in a simple coffin, was borne to the city cemetery of Plain-Palais. The coffin was followed by the patricians and clergy of Geneva, and great numbers of the people. Without the slightest ostentation, and in the customary manner (*à la façon accoutumée*), in accordance with his expressed desires, the body of Calvin was committed to the earth. His grave, which was marked by no monument, could in later years be discovered only with difficulty, and not with perfect certainty. Some twenty years ago a black grave-stone was placed on the spot conjectured to be that of the Reformer's interment. Of the less than fifty-five years which he had lived, the full half had been devoted almost exclusively to the ministry of the gospel.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

REVIEW OF CALVIN—THE CHURCH OF ZURICH AND THE CHURCH OF GENEVA—BULLINGER—THE CONSENSUS OF ZURICH—WESTPHAL AND CALVIN—LAST DAYS AND DEATH OF MELANCHTHON—THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE AND THE NETHERLANDS, HUNGARY, TRANSYLVANIA, POLAND, ITALY, AND THE CHURCH IN LOCARNO, SPAIN, ENGLAND.

WE cannot take leave of Calvin without glancing once more at his character, and comparing him with the two great German-speaking Reformers, Luther and Zwingle. His external appearance has been described by his friend Beza.[1] In stature he was not large, his complexion was pale and quite dark, his eyes were bright and sparkling, and his glance was acute. Who has not seen his picture, and involuntarily contrasted it with the very different faces of Luther and Zwingle? There is certainly no other of our Reformers concerning whom opinions are more at variance than they are over Calvin. In advancing this statement, we are not thinking of his opponents belonging either to the Roman Catholic or to the Lutheran Church. Our own Reformed Church is manifestly divided into two groups, composed respectively of those who regard either Zwingle or Calvin as the type and model of the true Reformed theologian. The sympathies with and antipathies against the Reformer of Geneva are due not simply to his nationality,—which, as a matter of course, impressed upon the visage of the Frenchman a stamp totally different from that borne by the physiognomies of the two Germans,—but rather to the peculiar personal

[1] Comp. HENRY, iii. chap. ii. p. 593.

characteristics of the man. Consider, moreover, in this relation, the difference in the natural dispositions of Calvin and Luther; the latter was hot-blooded and impetuous, the former a man of iron nerve and will. Each was possessed of a choleric temperament—tinged in the one case, however, with a melancholy, and in the other with a sanguine admixture; though Luther, in the later years of his life, became more phlegmatic. We have already drawn attention to the fact that an aristocratic element was co-operative in the education of Calvin, and accompanied him through life; while Luther and Zwingle were both men of the people, and true Germans, though of different tribes. Calvin's latest biography [1] correctly remarks,—but lays, perhaps, undue stress on the statement, —that the preaching of the Genevese Reformer woke an answering chord in the breast of the higher and educated circles of society more frequently than in the heart of the people, especially the country people. This may be accounted for partly by the fact that he was not encircled by a family life, such as surrounded Luther and Zwingle. Calvin did not belong to the home sphere, nor did he pertain, strictly speaking, to any particular national church, but to the whole Evangelical Church, as whose metropolis he regarded Geneva, with its theocratic regulations. His conflict with the Libertines is specially connected with the fact that he held the politico-civil interests of old Geneva and the Genevese burghers to be far inferior in importance to their religious interests, and, when it seemed requisite, sacrificed the former to the latter. Calvin had, so to speak, no earthly fatherland, whose liberty he felt impelled, like Zwingle, to defend. He considered it his vocation to gather all whom he could into the heavenly fatherland, the city of God. To him there was neither Greek nor Scythian, neither Frenchman, German, nor Switzer, but only the new creature in Christ Jesus. It would be folly to reproach him for entertaining such sentiments. Nay, it has justly been remarked, that Calvin, although he

[1] KAMPSCHULTE, p. 418.

sought not the greatness of *Geneva* as such, nevertheless assisted that city to attain to a world-historic glory, which without him would never have been hers.[1] It is true, however, that those purely human graces which have their root in the family and in the popular life, and which it is the mission of Christianity to ennoble, and not to destroy, were rather feebly developed in Calvin. Men of a severe turn of thought and rigidly legal ideas will be inclined to elevate Calvin above Luther and Zwingle. And in some points of character he was incontestably their superior. On the other hand, minds of a poetic and emotional cast will at first be chilled by Calvin's abstract piety, detached, as it seems to them, from the soil of nature, nor will they be able to overcome this feeling for some little time; while they are sensible of an immediate attraction to the heart-winning Luther, an attraction which ceases not even when he rages and fumes.

If we consider the two men in their relation to friend and foe, we find that Calvin is in general far removed from the plebeian roughness of Luther. In his intercourse with others he exhibits more urbanity and complaisance, qualities which the Frenchman usually possesses in a higher degree than the German; but Calvin could also be acrimonious when the occasion required. "A dog," thus he writes to the Queen of Navarre,[2] "barks when he sees his master attacked; it would be cowardice for me to see the truth of God attacked and keep silence." In his zeal for the word of the Lord, he, like Luther, knows no bounds in the choice of the terms which he employs against those whom he regards as its adversaries;[3] and although he does not, like Luther, always brandish the rude war-club of natural growth, he wields with even greater effect a well-practised sword, whose blade penetrates to the

[1] KRAUSS, "Calvin vor der exacten Geschichte" (in the *Kirchenblatt für die reformirte Kirche der Schweiz*, 1864, Nos. 22 and 23).

[2] *Epîtres françaises*, i. p. 114.

[3] *Porci, cani, nebulones*, are the honourable titles which he is ever bestowing upon his opponents, doubtless with a reference to Matt. vii. 6. He, however, frequently makes an unwarrantable application of these scriptural epithets.

very bone and marrow of his opponent. Calvin's true nobility and magnanimity are evidenced in one of his letters to Bullinger, in which he declared that he should not cease to regard Luther as a chosen minister of God, even though Luther were to call him a devil. He looked upon the German Reformer as a man "who exhibited both great virtues and great faults." And just such a man was Calvin himself.

We should do the Genevan Reformer injustice were we, on account of his ofttimes startling severity, to deny that he possessed any sensibility, or, still more, to affirm that he was destitute of love. It is a fact that the eternal truth of God, whereof he regarded himself as a herald, was considered by Calvin to have higher claims upon him than even natural affection for those to whom he was bound by the ties of kindred. "When I observe," he writes to another high patroness, the Duchess Rénée of Ferrara,—"when I observe any one malevolently striving to overthrow the word of God, and to quench the light of truth, I cannot forgive him such conduct, nor could I pardon him were he my own father a hundred times over."[1] But did not Luther make use of similar expressions? Did not Christ Himself thus speak? And who would venture to accuse the Saviour of a lack of love? Fidelity to God and His word did not with Calvin exclude fidelity to man; love to Christ did not shut out love to the brethren. On the contrary, if Calvin could hate heartily, he could also love with all his heart. He was constant in his friendships, and was capable of the greatest sacrifices when occasion demanded that he should prove his faith by works of love. During the prevalence of the plague he voluntarily offered himself for service at the hospital. The civil authorities would not, however, accept his offer, not being willing that he should abandon the regular course of his labours, upon which the blessing of God manifestly rested. Calvin's acquiescence in the will of his superiors, his refraining, like the general on

[1] *Epîtres françaises*, i. p. 47.

the battle-field, from heedless exposure of himself to the enemy's artillery, can assuredly not be censured, more especially as he at no time disdained diligently to visit and care for the sick in the city whenever it was possible. The inexhaustibleness of Calvin's loving impulse to help and advise on every side, and to comply with all requisitions upon him, from the weightiest demands upon his Christian charity down to the little courtesies of friendship, is most brilliantly evidenced by his extensive correspondence. How many tears were dried by this apparently austere man! From how many embarrassments did he extricate others! How many questions of conscience did he settle with his trusty counsel! In this respect he is in no wise inferior to Luther, and it may well be that he not unfrequently surpassed him in tact and tenderness.

We might pursue our comparison of the two Reformers still farther. We might show how much less sympathy with nature is exhibited by Calvin than by Luther, and how, on the other hand, the Genevan Reformer was less sensible of the influence of those occult forces which Luther battled against as demoniac powers.[1] In all things Calvin was more sober and moderate than Luther, and of all the Reformers he possessed the least poetic sentiment. On one solitary occasion he made trial of his powers of versification in a Latin poem, while Luther and Zwingle were in the habit of composing poetry in their vernacular tongue. Calvin was not lacking in wit, and that of an acute and trenchant, as well as subtile nature;[2] but he had no such sense of the ludicrous, no such aptness at pleasantries of an artless and popular, and hence

[1] It has been observed by HENRY, vol. i. p. 488, that Calvin gives himself much less concern about the devil than does Luther. (We have remarked the same in the case of Zwingle.) Not that the doctrinal idea of the devil was absent from Calvin's system or belief. He everywhere speaks of "Satan" (thus he most frequently styles him) when he is treating of hostility to the kingdom of God, or attacks upon the gospel. But of *personal* assaults, such as those from which Luther suffered, of diabolical phantasms, he is no less ignorant than Zwingle.

[2] His treatise against relics sometimes reminds one of Bayle and Voltaire.

also unpolished character—a species of humour native to the German mind and habit of thought, as we encounter in Luther's *Table Talk*, for instance. This very rigour, which, by a strict observance of discipline in every relation of life, withdraws all nourishment from the wantonness of the flesh, is by many regarded as an advantage that Calvinism possesses over Lutheranism. Luther himself could not withhold his praise from the strict exercise of ecclesiastical discipline which prevailed in all the Swiss churches. And assuredly, we ourselves are far from depreciating the lofty earnestness which pervades the whole Calvinistic system of Reform, and which gave it more and more of that steady consistency that was requisite in its conflict with opposing powers, and without which no victory is ever obtained. Hence we repeat the remark previously made, that neither Reformer can be said to be absolutely superior to the other, but that each supplemented the other in accordance with his peculiar God-given powers. In conclusion of our critique of Calvin, we cite, as expressive of our own views, the following observation of a contemporary author:—"Calvin erred, like every other pioneer mind, and sinned, like every child of Adam; but never since his time has any man laboured with equal earnestness and self-regardless energy in the effort, which is engaging the better minds of our own age, to bring all religious truth into ethical operation, and to make religion the ruling principle of ethics."[1]

Finally, in regard to the extent of the Calvinistic Reformation, we would observe that its principles are far more widely diffused than those of the Lutheran or the Zwinglian systems of Reform. In a certain sense, Calvin, in comparing himself with the other Reformers, might have repeated the words of the Apostle Paul: "I laboured more abundantly than they all" (1 Cor. xv. 10). Outside of Germany and Switzerland, with few exceptions, the Reformation assumed the Calvinistic

[1] KRAUSS, *l.c.*; comp. also HÄUSSER, *Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation*, pp. 256 sqq.

type. Though the ideas of Luther first found acceptance in the countries to which we refer, it was through the influence of Calvinistic principles that the Protestantism of those lands assumed an external form and organization, and attained to definite dimensions in the history of the world. The Zwinglian Reformation, against which the German Lutheran Church closed its doors, was confined to a narrow territory; it cannot be said that it prevailed even throughout Germanic Switzerland. In Basel, for instance, Œcolampadius pursued, in many respects, his own course, which differed from that of Zwingle in Zurich. Lutheran influences, likewise, began to be active in Switzerland.[1] Through the history of Calvin's first labours at Geneva, we are already acquainted with the conflicts which arose between the German (Bernese) and Romanic system of Reform in Geneva itself. The Zwinglian and Calvinistic Reformations at first stood in the relation of aliens to each other,—a relation fostered, doubtless, by the difference in their respective tongues,—and no small exertion was requisite to effect an approximation between the heterogeneous elements, and to induce them to unite.

Such was the task of Bullinger. In the year 1536, Bullinger made the acquaintance of Calvin at Basel; he afterwards exerted himself to procure his return from Strassburg to Geneva, and maintained an epistolary correspondence with him. He speedily came to an agreement with Calvin on the subject of the Lord's Supper, and also submitted his Latin treatise, *On the Sacraments*, to Calvin, who approved the views therein set forth. It was proposed that the Swiss churches should endeavour to arrive at an agreement concerning the doctrine of the sacraments. In March 1549, a synod was held for this purpose at Bern, at which Calvin was present. The Genevan Reformer then resolved to visit Zurich in person, which he accordingly did, stopping at Neuchatel to

[1] See HUNDESHAGEN, *Ueber die Conflicte des Zwinglianismus, Lutherthums, und Calvinismus in der Berner Landeskirche*, Bern, 1841.

induce Farel to accompany him. The two friends were kindly received by Bullinger and his colleagues, and the ensuing conference proceeded happily. In the first two hours of the session, a number of articles were agreed upon, which were afterward set forth in the so-called Consensus of Zurich (*Consensus Tigurinus*).[1] This consensus was agreed to by the other Swiss churches, although Bern at first objected to it. Followers of the Reformed doctrine in foreign lands likewise signified their assent to the consensus. Indeed, it may be said that the Reformed Churches scattered throughout the different countries of Europe now first became aware of their intrinsic connection.

The harmony thus exhibited proved highly vexatious to the rigid Lutheran party in Germany. Joachim Westphal, preacher in Hamburg, in the year 1552 attacked the consensus and assailed the Swiss doctrine of the Lord's Supper anew, in the tone which Luther had been wont to employ, but without the intellect displayed by the latter. Westphal enumerated no less than twenty-eight statements in which he declared that the Sacramentarians had contradicted themselves.[2] Calvin felt constrained to issue a defence of the Reformed doctrines against this assailant.[3] This vindication was not expressed in the most gentle terms imaginable, for he called Westphal a "beast," and Bullinger was obliged to recommend moderation.

Three years before Calvin's death, Melanchthon was gathered to the fathers. Before we take leave of the German and Swiss Reformations and glance at the course of Reform in other countries, let us take one more view of this great theologian. Without following his footsteps further in the

[1] The full title is as follows :—*Gegenseitige's Einverständniss in Betreff der Sacramente zwischen den Dienern der Kirche zu Zürich und Johann Calvin, Diener der Kirche zu Genf.* For particulars, see PESTALOZZI, pp. 378 sqq.

[2] Westphal's work bears the following title :—*Farrago confusanearum et inter se dissidentium opinionum de cœna Domini ex Sacramentariorum libris digesta.* It was followed in 1553 and 1555 by other polemical writings bearing various titles.

[3] *Defensio sanæ et orthodoxæ doctrinæ*, etc. (see PESTALOZZI and STÄHELIN, *l.c.*).

controversies in which he was involved, we shall speak only of the evening of his life and of his departure from this world, in order that a picture of Melanchthon's death-bed may not be lacking from the mental gallery in which we have already placed scenes from the last days of Luther, Œcolampadius, and Calvin.

Amid Melanchthon's many labours and conflicts, his strength had been visibly declining since the year 1558. An affection of the chest by which he was attacked, inspired his son-in-law, Doctor Peucer, with grave apprehensions. His hands began to tremble, his eyes grew weaker, and writing became more burdensome to him day by day. Notwithstanding this, he was indefatigable in letter-writing and in elaborating his learned works. In 1560 he entered upon his sixty-third year, a period which he had frequently termed a critical one. "If it be God's will," he said to his friends, "I should be glad to die; I desire to depart, in order to be with my dear Lord Christ." Again, he remarked to Camerarius[1] as they sat side by side on one occasion: "My dear Joachim, we have been good friends for nearly forty years, and have loved one another, not from interested motives, but freely, from our hearts; and we have both been schoolmasters and faithful comrades, each in his place, and I hope to God that our labour has not been in vain, but that it may have accomplished great good: if it be God's will that I should die, we will renew our friendship in the life to come." Camerarius then parted from him and saw him no more. The sick man had his travelling-bed put up in his study, saying that it would truly be a travelling-bed, for in it he should journey to his home. He was soon surrounded by his family, his friends, and his students. He bade them all an affectionate farewell and gave them friendly counsel. The thing that grieved him most and made it hard for him to die was "the wretched state of the holy Christian Church, resulting," as he said, "from the unnecessary division, malice, and wilfulness of those who, influenced

[1] [Joachim Camerarius, the biographer of Melanchthon.]

by their own inhuman envy and hatred, have separated from us without any just cause." During the night of the 18th and 19th of March, Melanchthon was more restless than usual. The hour of his death was approaching. The lectures at the University were intermitted on the following day, and the whole body of the students were invited to join in prayer. Melanchthon, on being asked by Peucer if there was anything he desired, replied, "Nothing but heaven, therefore ask me no more." This pastor prayed beside him and gave him his benediction, while other friends who were present knelt. Professor Winsheim repeated the words of the Psalm: "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit; Thou hast redeemed me, Thou faithful and true God." The lips of the dying man meantime moved in prayer. At seven o'clock he gently fell asleep, without a death struggle. And thus was granted the petition that he had so often urgently preferred before God, that He would deliver him from the "rage" (*rabies*) of the theologians who were pressing upon him.

On the day after his death, his old friend Lucas Cranach, who had portrayed Luther as he lay in his last slumber, took the likeness of Melanchthon once more. Students and burghers hastened to view the beloved remains. Fathers brought their little children, that in later years they might remember having looked upon this man of God.

George Major, vice-rector of the University, issued a "letter of lamentation and consolation," inviting attendance at the funeral of Melanchthon. A long funeral cortege proceeded first to the parish church, where a discourse was delivered by Paul Eber, and thence to the Castle church, where Vitus Winsheim delivered another oration. The coffin was lowered to a final resting-place, opposite the grave of Luther. The tidings of Melanchthon's death everywhere occasioned profound mourning. It was felt that in the departure of Germany's great teacher, a brilliant star had set.

It now remains for us to glance at the condition of the other countries of Europe at the time of which we treat, and

for the present this glance must necessarily be a hasty one. In a subsequent series of lectures (vol. iv. of our *Church History*), we propose to set forth in detail the history of Reform in the countries to which we have reference, in connection with their further religious development subsequent to the age of the Reformation. We have time now only for such particulars as are necessary to complete this sketch of the History of the Reformation which we have framed in the narrow limits of a half century.

France[1] had been ruled since 1547 by Henry II., son of Francis I. With Henry, as we have already seen, Maurice of Saxony had formed an alliance against the Emperor Charles V. Henry was altogether led by his favourites, the Constable de Montmorency and Diana of Poitiers, Duchess of Valentinois, the mistress of the king, and, besides these two, Cardinal Charles de Lorraine and Marshal de St. André. All of these were decided opponents of Protestantism. When, in 1549 Henry made his solemn entry into Paris, there were blazing, as if in celebration of the festal occasion, the flames of funeral piles on which heretics were being sacrificed. In June 1551 was issued the edict of Chateaubriant, in accordance with which Parliament and the Episcopal courts were united in one court of inquisition, over which the Dominican, Matthias Orri, presided. The estates of refugees were confiscated, and all books and pamphlets published in Germany or Geneva were seized. In 1552 an interdict was laid upon the so-called private schools (*écoles buissonnières*), in which the Protestants were endeavouring to instruct the youth in their doctrine. Numerous executions took place in the years 1553 and 1554 also. I will but mention in passing those five students of Lausanne, young men from different parts of France, who, after a tedious imprisonment, were consigned to the flames on

[1] CROTTET, *Petite chronique de France, 16me siècle*, Paris, 1846; FÉLICE, *Histoire des Protestants de France*, Paris, 1850; DRION, *Histoire chronologique de l'église protestante de France*, Paris, 1855; PUAUX, *Histoire de la réformation française*, Paris, 1857.

the 6th of May 1553.[1] Amid all these distresses, the Protestants of France clung faithfully together. De la Ferrière, a nobleman, and Le Macon, a clergyman, were the central personages of the Parisian congregation, which was obliged to keep itself as secret as possible. Similar religious fellowships were to be found at the same time at Meaux, Angers, Poitiers, Bourges, Blois, Tours, Orleans, Rouen, Sens, Dijon, and La Rochelle. Indeed, in September 1555, at the very time when the Peace of Augsburg, sanctioning the Reformation, was concluded in Germany, the foundation was laid in France for an organization of the Evangelical congregations subsisting in that kingdom.

In the Netherlands, where heretic blood first was shed, Protestantism continued to be persecuted. In 1531 the Stadtholderess Margaret, aunt of Charles v., died. She was succeeded by her sister Mary, queen-dowager of Hungary. Although this lady was well affected toward the Protestants, her position prohibited her from espousing their cause. On the contrary, she was prevailed upon by the Papal legate to employ violent measures against them. In the year 1543 several Protestants were condemned to the flames, and in 1546 the theologians of Louvaine prepared an index of prohibited books, among which were included the Holy Scriptures, *i.e.* any translations of them in the vernacular. On the 2d of April 1550, the laws relating to prohibited books were renewed, and the most cruel penalties threatened against all who were disobedient. The inquisitors were authorized to arrest suspected persons of either sex and of every rank. Incarceration, capital punishment, and confiscation of property were the means employed to intimidate the Evangelicals.

In Hungary the gospel had been preached by Luther's table companion, Matthias Devay, who has been called the

[1] See PIPER'S *Evangelischen Kalender*, 1860, pp. 170 sqq. We purpose recurring to the story of these martyrdoms in the next volume of the *Church History*.

Hungarian Luther.[1] He suffered bonds for Christ's sake at Ofen, and at Vienna answered for himself before Bishop Faber. After visiting his beloved Wittenberg once more, he returned to his native land, bearing recommendations from Melanchthon, and was supported in his proclamation of the Reformed doctrines by Thomas Nadasdy, who in 1554 had become Palatine of Hungary.

In Transylvania, another Wittenberg scholar, John Honter by name, pastor of Kronstadt (since 1544), defended the Evangelical faith against its opponents. At the synod of Madiasch (1545) the Confession of Augsburg was adopted. An Evangelical school was founded at Kronstadt.

In Poland the dissenters, comprising Lutherans, Calvinists, and Bohemian Brethren, were tolerated under the government of the last of the Jagellons, King Sigismund II. (Sigismund Augustus). Many magnates and nobles, and also burghers, embraced the Evangelical faith, without encountering the slightest opposition.[2] One of the most distinguished of the Reformed theologians of Poland was Francis Lismann, a native of the isle of Corfu. In 1553 Lismann travelled through Italy and Switzerland, and formed the acquaintance of Calvin at Geneva. Though he had stood high in favour with the king, his formal adoption of the Reformed faith drew upon him the royal displeasure. Being obliged to leave Poland, he repaired to Königsberg, where he was appointed counsellor to Duke Albert of Prussia. We have also to mention, in this connection, Francis Stancarus of Mantua, who was a teacher of Hebrew at Cracow, and, above all, John a Lasco (Lasky),[3] a

[1] See Luther's letters, DE WETTE, v. No. 2111 (of the year 1542), and No. 2206, to the clergy in Eperies, 21st April 1544.

[2] The city of Thorn, which was for some time held in bondage to Rome by Bishop Hosius, obtained permission under this king, by a patent dated 25th March 1557, freely and publicly to exercise the Protestant religion. See BROHN, "Kirchliche zustände in Thorn, 1520–1551," in the *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1869, p. 4.

[3] This person must not be confounded with the elder John a Lasco, archbishop of Gnesen and primate of Poland (he died in 1531), who was a friend of Erasmus, by whom his learning and piety were highly extolled. Our Lasky was born at

native of Poland. These two, however, caused their light to shine not only in Poland, but also elsewhere.

In Italy the battle of minds was still going forward. It will suffice to mention a few particulars of the conflict. Since the year 1524 there had been formed, in Milan and other cities of Lombardy and the Venetian territory, small and great Evangelical communities, in which the Scriptures of the New Testament and the writings of the Reformers were read. At Bologna, where many Germans were pursuing their studies, the ideas of the Reformers found more and more acceptance. In this city the Franciscan monk, Giovanni Mollio, a native of Montalcino (near Siena), was discharging the functions of preacher and professor. He had been convinced of the untenableness of the Romish faith by Bullinger's treatise on the mass and the invocation of saints. After this change in his religious views, he delivered lectures on the Pauline Epistles. In consequence of the doctrines thus set forth by him, an endeavour was made to remove him from Bologna, and in 1538, at the instigation of the Cardinal-legate Campeggio, he was appointed lector in the monastery of San Lorenzo at Naples. This very act advanced the cause which it was intended to injure. Juan Valdez, a Spaniard, who since 1536 had been secretary to the Viceroy of Naples, was then gathering around him a circle of men and women who held their religious meetings in various places, but principally in the palaces and villas of the great (sometimes at the residence of the Viceroy himself). This company, which called itself "The Blessed Fellowship," was joined by Mollio and his two famous Tuscan compatriots, Bernardino Occhino and Peter Martyr. Occhino, the Capuchin general, was among the most celebrated pulpit orators of Italy. Charles V., on hearing one of his

Warsaw in 1499; he studied at Zurich and Basel, and was on friendly terms with many of the Swiss Reformers. We shall meet with him again in the church history of England. He died in 1560. M. Göbel (in Herzog's *Realenc.* viii. p. 304) remarks concerning him: "He was in learning an Erasmian, in faith a Lutheran (?), in his mode of worship a Zwinglian, and in his ideas of church polity a Calvinist" (!).

sermons at Naples in 1536, exclaimed, "Truly this monk could draw tears from stones!" Soon the fruits of the preaching of the gospel became manifest. One who lived at the time[1] thus describes the awakening that ensued: "Truly a wonderful phenomenon is occurring in these our days. Women, whose minds are usually inclined to vanity rather than to learning, manifest that they have penetrated deep into the truths of salvation; and men in the humblest circumstances, even soldiers, show us a picture of the perfect Christian life! Century worthy of the Golden Age! Merciful God, what a rich outpouring of the Holy Spirit!" But a change was soon to take place. The Inquisition, introduced into Italy in 1542, dispersed the "Blessed Fellowship." Mollio left Naples in 1548. After experiencing a variety of fortunes, he was arrested at Ravenna in 1553, at the command of Julius III., and conducted to Rome. There he was examined before the tribunal of the Inquisition. He defended himself and his faith with undaunted courage; and when the flaming torch was placed in his hand (as was customary at abjurations), he indignantly cast it at the feet of his judges. He suffered martyrdom on the Campo Fiore, in company with his pupil Tisserano.

In the year 1543 there appeared in Venice a noteworthy book, *Concerning the Benefit of Christ* (*Del beneficio di Christo*), in which the Evangelical doctrine of justification was clearly and simply set forth. The book attained an extraordinary circulation. It is said that about 40,000 copies of it were gradually scattered abroad. The Inquisition, however, succeeded in destroying almost all of these. For a long time it was believed that the book had entirely disappeared, but a copy of it was at last discovered in our own century (1855) in the library at Cambridge; this was imme-

[1] GIAMBATTISTA FALENGO, in Christoffel's *Lebens-und Leidensbilder evangelischer Märtyrer Italiens*, Bern, 1869. Besides an account of the martyrdom of Mollio, this book relates the story of the martyrs Francesco Gamba of Brescia (died 1554) and Pomponio Algieri of Nola (died 1556).

diately published, being also translated into German. Inquiry has been made concerning the author of this anonymous treatise. It is believed to have been the work of Aonio Paleario.[1] This man, who was born in the Pelasgic village of Veroli, near Rome, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, was at all events an important witness for Evangelical truth, whether or not he was the author of the little book in question. He was a lover of Humanistic culture, but was also impressed by the power of the religious ideas diffused by the Reformation. In 1543 he fell under accusation on account of his Evangelical sentiments, and received a warning from his friend Cardinal Sadolet. Subsequently (in July 1570) he also suffered a martyr's death.[2]

We have still to speak of the fortunes of the Evangelical Church in Locarno, in the province of Tessin, which since 1512 had been under the government of the Confederate Cantons.[3] Evangelical life had been awakened there in Zwingle's time. The confessors of the newly-awakened faith received Bibles from Zurich. The writings of Erasmus and Bullinger likewise found access to the town. The school teacher Giovanni Beccaria formed the centre of the little congregation, which, about the middle of the sixteenth century, numbered some two hundred souls. When, however, Beccaria ventured to preach publicly in one of the neighbouring churches, he incurred sentence of banishment. He fled to Zurich, where Bullinger received him with open arms. Calvin and Farel also interested themselves in the Locarnese Church, whose prospects, after the departure of Beccaria, became daily more threatening. In the autumn of 1554, the Papal legate Riverta appeared at a Diet of the Swiss Cantons assembled in

[1] The question does not seem to be absolutely settled yet.

[2] For particulars see SCHMIEDER, in Piper's *Evangelischen Kalender*, 1857; C. SCHMIDT (in Herzog's *Realenc.* xi. p. 47); and JULES BONNET, *Aonio Paleario, étude sur la réforme en Italie*, Paris, 1863.

[3] [Tessin or "Ticino was conquered from Italy by the Swiss in 1512, and, under the name of the Italian bailiwicks, governed by deputies until 1815, when it was admitted as a member of the Swiss Confederation."—TR.]

Baden, and procured the decree that all of the Locarnese who would not return to the old Roman Catholic faith should remove themselves and their possessions from the country before the following Shrove Tuesday. In order to the execution of this decree, messengers from Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Freiburg, Solothurn, and Glarus repaired to Locarno, and commanded the inhabitants to present themselves before them. The Evangelicals made their appearance in a long procession, the men going before and being followed by the women, who marched two and two, accompanied by their children, and made confession of their faith. The legate strove in vain to induce them to recant, and they were obliged to leave the country. They set forth on their pilgrimage on the 3d of March 1555, and found a temporary asylum at Roveredo, in the Misoxer valley. The hospitable Zurich offered them shelter for a longer period. On the 12th of May the main body of refugees, numbering 112 souls, arrived at the last-named city, some few having made their appearance previously. Others followed. The entire company amounted to 120 adults and 80 children. "A stone might have been moved to compassion," says an eye-witness, "at sight of this train." Bullinger, who frequently entertained at his table as many as twenty of these refugees, joyfully wrote to Calvin as follows: "These are honourable people who have sought an asylum with us; our burghers are gracious and favourable to them." The still flourishing families of the Orellis and Muraltos are, as is well known, descendants of these exiles.[1]

In Spain, the fatherland of Juan Valdez, whom we met with in Italy as secretary of the Viceroy of Naples, Pope Clement VII. had, in the year 1534, appointed Diego de Silva inquisitor. By De Silva's command, Rodrigo de Valer, one of the first confessors of the gospel in Spain, was confined for life in a monastery. De Valer, previous to his imprisonment, had inspired Juan Gil, Doctor Egidius, with his own Evangelical

[1] See F. MEYER, *Die evangelische Gemeinde in Locarno*, ii., Zurich, 1836; PESTALOZZI, *Bullinger*, pp. 359 sqq.; and HERZOG'S *Realenc.* xx. pp. 1 sqq.

sentiments, and Egidius communicated the same to Vargas and Constantino Ponce de la Fuente. Egidius himself was incarcerated, and died soon after his release, in 1555. In Spain, as in Italy, a little company of Evangelical believers soon banded themselves together, the first such society being formed at Seville. In 1544 a secret Protestant Church arose in Valladolid also. A year previous to the last date, Francisco Enzinas (Dryander) published a Spanish translation of the New Testament; a further translation by Juan Perez appeared at Venice in 1556. We shall revert at some future time to these manifestations of an Evangelical sentiment in Spain.

We have finally to glance at the religious condition of the British Islands. As we have already remarked, the historical connections of the Reformation in England and Scotland are entirely different from those of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, and other countries; and it will be necessary for us here to make a few statements illustrative of this fact, even at the risk of having to repeat what is here premised in our future connected history of the English and Scottish Reformations.

It will be remembered that Henry VIII. of England assumed a hostile attitude toward Luther and his Reformation. This attitude continued to be essentially the same. But a change took place in the king's bearing toward the pope and the Roman See when the latter refused to consent to Henry's divorce from Catharine of Arragon, the daughter of Ferdinand of Spain. The opinions of theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, to whom the king applied, were diverse, and Henry accomplished the divorce by his own authority, and at the same time separated the Church of England, which he took under his own protection, from that of Rome. Bishop Cranmer, to whom we shall recur at a subsequent period, was created Archbishop of Canterbury. The cloisters were suppressed. In the matter of doctrine there was no change. It was even forbidden, on pain of death, to teach or to believe

otherwise than was prescribed in the royal Articles of Blood,[1] the "whip with six lashes," as those articles were termed in popular parlance. Opposition to these ordinances cost Thomas Cromwell, prime minister of England, his life. Cranmer himself was frequently in danger of a similar fate, but by skilful diplomacy succeeded in averting it. In the year 1547, Edward VI. succeeded his father on the throne of the Tudors. He was the son of Henry's third wife, Jane Seymour, and at the time of his accession was but nine years of age. Under the protectorate of the Earl of Hertford, Cranmer, who instilled the best Protestant principles into the mind of his royal pupil, was enabled to abolish from the ritual of public worship many usages which had remained inviolable in the reign of Henry. Images and crucifixes were removed from the churches. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Bonner and Tonstal, bishops of London and Durham, opposed the innovations, while Bishop Ridley sided with Cranmer. A book of homilies, compiled (1547) by Cranmer and Ridley, in conjunction with Hugh Latimer, gave to the preaching of the word in the public worship of God its predominance over the simply ritual portions of the service. In the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the administration of both elements to the laity was introduced. Confession was left at the option of the people. Other usages, such as exorcism at baptism, confirmation, and even extreme unction, were retained for the sake of the weak. The new Parliament of 1548 conferred upon the clergy permission to marry. The Common Prayer-Book, published by Cranmer, established the liturgy of the Church of England. In order to the further prosecution of the Reformation, Martin Bucer, and his pupil Paul Fagius, of Zabern in Alsace, were invited to England, and installed as professors at Cambridge. To the faculty of Oxford were added the two Italians, Peter Martyr Vermigli,[2] of Florence, and

[1] [The six articles, adopted in 1539, favourable to the Romish doctrines concerning the Lord's Supper, celibacy, and confession.—Tr.]

[2] See C. Schmidt in the *Väter und Begründer*, vol. vii.

the Capuchin Bernardino Occhino of Siena. Bucer succeeded in gaining the affection of the young king, for whom he composed his treatise on *The Kingdom of God.* Under the influence of Bucer, a Confession of Faith was drawn up, composed of forty-two articles, which were subsequently (in the reign of Elizabeth) reduced to thirty-nine. The constitution of the Church was likewise established, so far as its principal features were concerned. But, on the 6th of June 1553, Edward VI. died, in the sixteenth year of his age, and with him the hopes which centred upon the success of the Reformation in England were carried to the grave. After the failure of the attempt to enthrone a Protestant, the youthful Lady Jane Grey, a grand-niece of Henry VIII., whose reign lasted but nine days, and who atoned on the scaffold for the act of temerity to which she had been persuaded by her husband, Lord Dudley, Edward's half-sister, Mary, the only issue of Henry by Catharine of Arragon, commenced her bloody reign. In 1554 Mary was united in marriage to Philip, son of Charles V., and subsequently king of Spain, under the title of Philip II. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was created chancellor of the kingdom, and upon Cardinal Reginald Pole was devolved the systematic prosecution of anti-reform measures. Ridley, former bishop of London, and Hugh Latimer, bishop of Winchester, were cast into prison, and executed on the 16th of October 1555. Cranmer had been imprisoned in the Tower as early as 14th September 1553, and died at the stake after having made a recantation [which, however, he retracted] on the 21st of May 1556. In our subsequent *History of the Church* we purpose recurring to the martyrdom of these men. For the present, suffice it to say that during the reign of Bloody Mary (she died 17th November 1558) no less than two hundred and seventy-three persons were sacrificed as heretics, five bishops and twenty-one clergymen being among the number. It was not until the accession of Elizabeth that the Reformation of England was consummated.

A remarkable pendant to the English Reformation is to be found in the Reformation of Scotland,[1] under the leadership of John Knox. Treatment of this topic must, however, also be reserved, as the period of Knox's greatest activity lies beyond the chronological limits of the present work.

[1] Of the Scottish martyr Hamilton, mention has already been made in chap. xxiv. p. 153.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

GENERAL REMARKS — INFLUENCE OF THE REFORMATION OVER POLITICS, SCIENCE, ART, AND MORALS—PECULIAR THINKERS IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION: SCHWENKFELDT, SEBASTIAN FRANCK, AND OTHERS — APOSTATES: THAMER, WICEL, SPIERA.

IN opening the present chapter with general remarks on the Reformation, I am well aware that a wide field lies outspread before me, an expanse over which it is possible to roam at will, without ever arriving at a certain or satisfactory terminus. It is nevertheless a fact that every work requires a proper conclusion, and though I should not have much to say that is new,—though, on the contrary, I should but recall what has already been said, supplying some details, and indicating others in the most cursory manner,—I must not on that account withdraw from the task.[1]

The Reformation, as we have seen, was not modelled after a preconceived design. It grew out of the conscience of Luther; out of the wholesome sense and moral strength of Zwingle; and, furthermore, out of the heart of the people, over whom the sparks scattered by the revivers of the gospel exerted an electric influence; and, finally, by Calvin, who also was actuated by conscience, by moral and religious motives, the Reformation was moulded into a world-conquering power. Hence, it is manifest that the men whom we call

[1] Worthy of recommendation, as bearing upon the subject of which we are treating, is VILLERS' *Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la Réformation de Luther*, Paris, 1804 (new ed. 1851). This essay, to which a prize was awarded, was translated from the French by Cramer, and published, with a preface and notes by Henke, at Hamburg in 1805.

Reformers did not primarily aim at effecting a reform in the individual provinces of life. The word *reformation* misleads us if it suggest to our minds only the repairing of that which is in ruins, or the supplementing of that which is defective, etc. Such restorations and supplementings had their place, it is true, but it was a secondary place. At present, however, it is precisely these *secondary* operations of the principles of the Reformation which must engage our attention if we desire to answer the question as to what *influence* the Reformation exerted, designedly and consciously, or involuntarily and unconsciously, over these different provinces of human life.

The operation of the Reformation was (we repeat) primarily of a *religious* character, in the truest and deepest sense of the term. It was the aim of the Reformers not only to alter the evident externals of religion, namely, dogma and worship, but also to effect a radical change in the *religious sentiments* of the age. Their aspirations were not limited to the alteration of any particular forms; the desire to purify the spring of life, hidden deep in the breast of man, was what incited the Reformers to the conflict, and gave them courage to persevere therein. If we look back to the history of Luther, we shall see that it was no isolated and abstract idea, withdrawn from the domain of practical life, and pertaining purely to the schools, that summoned Luther to the battle-field; it was human life itself that seized him with mighty arms, and thrust him forth to the conflict. The corruption of the Church, the universal decay of religion, manifested most conspicuously by the indulgence traffic, pressed upon the German monk like a many-headed hydra, and woke within him that herculean power which had before been slumbering unsuspectingly within its cradle. Luther's resolve to inaugurate a reformation was not ripened under a sunny sky, or in the joyous banqueting hall (as may be said to be the case with the plans of the Reformers of our own century); it came to maturity in the dark and quiet cell of a cloister; amid

anguish and tears was born the new man who, made strong in God, ventured to undertake a great, a gigantic task. And though the efforts of the other Reformers were not preceded by the same mighty internal conflicts which convulsed the soul of Luther (and it were folly to require that such should have been experienced by all), they also were moved by a consideration of the *seriousness of life* to oppose the prevailing abuses; and the inner sanctification of man by the new birth in the Spirit was the goal toward which their labours tended.

But though this *one* operation of the Reformation is that upon which we must once and again insist as incomparably the most important of its effects, it would be improper for us to ignore or under-estimate the other, although indirect, workings of the Reform. It is true that the Reformation was, primarily, neither political nor scientific in its nature. Neither liberty of thought nor enlightenment, at least in the current modern acceptation of the terms, was the primary or, still less, the sole object of its endeavours. Notwithstanding that such was the case, however, liberty of thought and enlightenment, true liberality and true humanity, were promoted by the Reformation, and promoted to a greater extent than they would have been by more direct efforts in their favour. There was afforded practical illustration of the deeper meaning of those words of our Lord: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Let us now briefly consider these indirect operations of the Reformation. Over *politics* the Reformation undeniably exercised a decided influence. It is true that Luther, as we have seen, strove to preserve the current of Reform free from all political admixture, and he was right in thus striving; we have seen, moreover, that in his dealings with the insurgents, he defended a system which we could not approve in all its parts even though we honoured the religious basis thereof. But although Luther himself had no desire to make the Reformation a matter of politics, it unavoidably became so through

the force of circumstances. It is, for instance, a fact that it furnished occasion to the German princes to increase the power of the intermediate ranks, and to circumscribe the authority of the head of the empire. It was by Landgrave Philip of Hesse that the political side of the Reformation was most warmly espoused, and by him many a scruple of Luther's relative to the propriety of an interference in politics on the part of the Evangelicals was overleaped; while the princes of the Ernestine branch of the house of Saxony continued more obedient pupils of the Wittenberg theologian until the outbreak of the Schmalkaldic War, when Luther's warning voice was silenced. In consequence of this war, as we have seen, and especially in consequence of Maurice's attitude therein, the whole affair of the Reformation assumed a political turn.

In Switzerland matters were different. From the outset, Zwingle endeavoured to effect a reform in politics as well as in religion; and while he fought against superstition, he also combated the system of foreign military service and foreign pensions. In Basel, as well as Zurich, the political and ecclesiastical changes lay side by side and in the same scale. Nowhere, however, did the Reformation more deeply permeate the political life of a state than at Geneva; and there, also, the political transformations that occurred were the products of a grand religious idea—namely, that of a theocracy. All these phenomena suggest the question, how far the Reformation was simply the fortuitous cause of contemporaneous political changes,—if, indeed, it had more than an external connection with them,—or how far the ideas of the Reformation actually influenced the political temper and tendency of the age. In regard to the latter query, it may be remarked that a political conviction based upon Protestantism must necessarily have been of gradual formation, for the first influences of the Reformation over politics were exercised in part unconsciously. Thus much is certain, the Reformation was pressed into the service of politics, but the Reformers had no preconceived intention of effecting political changes.

Thus, the various forms of government which the Reformation found established in the different countries in which it operated, remained substantially unchanged by that great religious revolution; Germany and Scandinavia still retain their monarchical government, and Switzerland continues to be an aristocratic democracy. It may be said that in political sentiment Luther was a monarchist, Zwingle a democrat, and Calvin an aristocrat; but their respective opinions harmonized with the circumstances in which God had placed them, and they conceived not the idea of altering those circumstances by a political revolution.

Upon *science* the effect of the Reformation was still more immediate than upon politics. In considering this topic, however, we must not forget that the prime effort of the Reformation was not simply to clear away scientific fogs. Although the Reformation joyfully set foot upon the soil prepared by Humanism, its subsequent course was not always in accordance with Humanistic endeavours. In fact, the paths of the two, Humanism and the Reformation, actually diverge. We know how anxious Erasmus became about the "good sciences" when the uneducated masses were seized with the mania of Reformation (we speak from his point of view). It is as if we heard an Archimedes crying to the impetuous Luther, "Do not destroy my circles!" Erasmus beheld in the Reformation the return of barbarism. And yet, even in regard to science, the Reformation, without originally intending such a result, outstripped the book-learning of Erasmus himself. It was, in fact, the Reformation which created science, which caused it to become what we now understand by the word "science;" for if science consists not in a simple knowledge of *things*, but in the knowledge of what *is known*, *i.e.* in the free intellectual appropriation and mastery of the materials of knowledge, then *Protestantism* alone is compatible with a true scientific spirit. It is true that the Catholic Church has promoted partial enlightenment, and popes, such as Leo X. and Sixtus V., have actively favoured some grand scientific enter-

prises; but Protestantism has operated decisively upon the whole treatment, critical and philosophic, of science. The Jesuits, for instance, following in the track of the Reformation, have diffused much useful knowledge; but it has been always of a kind which they believed could not promote liberality of thought—such, for example, as the mathematical, the so-called exact, sciences, which can be treated apart from all religious and moral speculation. But Protestantism has promoted those sciences which affect the spiritual life of mankind, which implant and cultivate noble and liberal sentiments, and retro-act upon the great domains of moral liberty, upon the domains of religion and politics. As we have already seen, the spirit of the Reformation at first addressed itself with decided predilection to the study of the *ancient languages*, a field of labour in which Humanism, in reviving classical studies, had preceded it. There is; however, nothing fortuitous in the circumstance that our Reformers availed themselves of the models of classic antiquity for the cultivation of their minds. Not only did the study of Greek assist them to an understanding of the New Testament in its original tongue, as the study of Hebrew enabled them to understand the Old Testament in the original; but intercourse with the classics, that daily communion with them which accompanied the study of the Bible, gave to the Reformers scientific stability and social polish. It may be thought singular at the present day that the most important theological works of that age were written in Latin, and that Latin was universally employed by learned men in their intercourse with one another, while frequent references were made, also, to the Greek sages and poets. But—we put the question to every one who is acquainted with the writings of the Reformers—is there not something delightful in precisely this free and easy use of the Latin language, something attractive in the very style of the productions in which it is employed? What enjoyment is afforded by a perusal of the letters of Melanchthon and Calvin! We take, indeed, no less delight in the vigorous German of Luther and Zwingle, which, like

the pithy French of Calvin, has its own peculiar charm. But we gladly follow Luther and Zwingle, also, when they too strike into the wonted path of Latin. The period of this general literary use of the Latin tongue was a unique one. It was a period of transition. Men of learning subsequently ceased to restrict themselves to a classical mode of expression after their vernacular tongues had arrived at maturity. We have already remarked upon the unnatural practice of amalgamating Christian ideas with reminiscences of heathen mythology, a practice which Zwingle sometimes encouraged by his example. Even in the age of the Reformation, however, there were some who doubted if a study of the heathen classics were consistent with Christianity. To the existence of this doubt we have noteworthy testimony.[1] In the year 1522, Felix, a son of Oswald Myconius, referred a conscientious scruple of this sort to Zwingle, whom he honoured as a father. He wrote to him that he had read the classics diligently and had found in them much beauty and elegance of style, but also many unchaste and impious things, in which a Christian could not possibly take pleasure; and he thought that moral contamination, rather than edification, must result from the study of them. He therefore begged Zwingle to request his father to let him learn a trade instead of tormenting himself any longer with the ancients, and promised, on the other hand, never to neglect the study of the Bible. We know not what reply Zwingle made to this letter, nor how much indolence may have been concealed behind the piety of the young man. But it is a fact that this question, as proposed by a student to Zwingle, has been again and again repeated in different forms. It may always be answered, however, by the assurance that a healthy study of theology cannot dispense with the Humanistic foundation, and that, consequently, *philology*—*i.e.*, not merely a knowledge of the ancient languages, but an acquaintance with classical antiquity in all its extent—is indispensable to the Evangelical theologian.

[1] *Zwinglii Opera*, vii. (*Epp.* i. p. 258).

Philology apprehended in this sense is a daughter of Protestant theology. Philology and theology were for a long time united in close bonds, not merely from custom, but also from a conviction of their intrinsic affinity and the propriety of their conjunction; and although at this present day, by reason of the constantly-increasing need for a division of labour, the bonds which unite the two sciences have been steadily loosening, a complete severance of them would necessarily lead us back to barbarism. Luther, with true tact, recognised the great importance of philological study, when he called the languages the scabbard which contains the sword of the Spirit. For us of the present day this speech, of course, is primarily applicable to our vernacular tongue; but that the latter has attained to its present perfection in consequence of the study of the ancient languages, is a fact well known to all who are earnest and thorough students of philology.

And what was the attitude of the Reformation toward *philosophy?* In our remarks on the character of Luther (chap. xxiii.), we showed that that Reformer was far from assigning to philosophy a prominent place in his work, and that, on the contrary, he spoke most contemptuously thereof. For others was reserved the task of opening new paths for philosophy.[1] We shall return hereafter to a consideration of this topic; we must not, however, at this time overlook the meritorious service rendered by Melanchthon in his just appreciation of Aristotle,[2] and the high importance which attaches to Zwingle as a speculative thinker has long been recognised. That, however, in general an original mode of thought, independent of all traditional school systems, was awakened by the spirit of the Reformation, is a fact which

[1] See CARRIERE, *Philosophische Weltanschauung im Reformations zeitalter*, Stuttgart, 1847.

[2] SCHMIDT, *Melanchthon*, p. 676. Even Melanchthon regarded the union of *religion* and *philosophy* as the greatest ornament of a man of culture: "Nullum profecto majus decus hominum in hac vita esse judico quam copulationem veræ invocationis Dei cum vera philosophia, h. e. naturæ consideratione" (*Corp. Ref.* vii. p. 126).

needs not proof. The whole history of modern philosophy—from Leibnitz to Kant, and from Kant to Hegel—bears a Protestant character. And it is the same with *history*. The institution of historical investigations was not the primary task of the Reformers. Their Reformation itself constituted an essential part of history. Times like theirs, of historical revolution, must leave the task of recording them and commenting upon them to posterity. The Reformation had in many respects broken with preceding history, but it retained that historical foundation which the radical tendency of the age rejected. A Protestant investigation and presentation of history was reserved for after times. Nor did succeeding ages fail to produce this. A taste for historical criticism was awakened by the Reformation. And though it cannot be denied that Protestant historiography continued for a length of time to be bound by confessional prejudices, it is nevertheless a fact that the increased independence of opinion concerning historical matters, the large-heartedness which does justice even to an opponent, is a fruit of the spirit of the Reformation.[1] The idea of *historical development* is an idea of Protestantism, while the clinging to mere ordinance and tradition is characteristic of the opposite religion.

What, again, was the attitude of the Reformation toward *nature* and *natural philosophy?* It may almost be said that the latter had not yet come into existence. At the time of the Reformation, the study of the natural sciences was in its infancy, and hence it is impossible to affirm that the Reformation exerted any direct enlightening influence

[1] It is a fact patent to every one that the historical horizon of the Reformers was a limited one, as was also their view of nature, its laws and phenomena. As the earth was to them the centre of the universe, so the history of Israel, and whatever is connected therewith, was regarded by them as the centre of the world's history. And there was, manifestly, much to warrant this standpoint in its day. Viewed from it, the history of religions necessarily assumed peculiar importance. Only think of the difficulties which beset the publication of the Koran in Luther's time! See the author's essay on Luther and the Koran before the Council of Basel, in *Beiträge zur vaterländischen Geschichte*, published by the Historical Society of Basel, 1870, vol. ix. [The view of the Reformers in regard to the history of Israel seems to be the true one.—TR.]

thereupon. Luther, indeed, on several occasions expressed himself adverse to certain superstitious ideas of the astrologers, etc.; but, on the other hand, he and his comtemporaries shared the same prejudices. Thus Luther, for instance, regarded whales and certain kinds of caterpillars as nothing but incarnate devils. We have seen with what zeal Reuchlin devoted himself to cabalistic studies. Even the otherwise clear-headed Melanchthon was himself not free from superstitious ideas, and (in opposition to Luther) defended astrology. He himself cast the nativity not only of each of his children, but also of friends and princes. His letters teem with observations on the conjunctions of planets, on the appearance of comets, and the like—events whence he drew conclusions of coming disaster, of plague, war, and dissension, and which frequently filled him with infinite anxiety.[1] Calvin had more liberal ideas on the subject, and in 1549 published a tractate warning men against astrological superstition.[2] Here and there we find, even in the age of the Reformation, a sober-minded observation of nature; as, for instance, in the Swiss Conrad Gessner, a natural philosopher and man of varied learning, who died in 1565.[3] The reform which was then in course of preparation in the natural sciences, was primarily independent of confessional differences. Copernicus (who died in 1543) belonged to the Catholic Church, and dedicated his great work, *De orbium cœlestium revolutionibus* (1543), to Pope Paul III. His system was opposed both by the Catholic and the Protestant orthodoxy of those days. It was reserved for a subsequent age to clear up the relation of the natural sciences to religion and theology.

It has frequently been charged upon the Reformation that, while it indisputably promoted the interests of science, it had an unfavourable effect upon *art*. There is, doubtless, some

[1] SCHMIDT, *l.c.* p. 684.

[2] STÄHELIN, ii. pp. 353 sqq.

[3] See the monograph of J. HANHART, Winterthur, 1844. Felix Plater, Caspar Bauhin, Vesalio, and others are also deserving of mention in this connection.

truth in this assertion. The simplification of divine worship was attended, as has already been indicated, by a diminution of the direct ministry of art in matters pertaining to the worship of God. It happened at this time, as in the first ages of Christianity, that many painters and sculptors abandoned their profession. This course was adopted by the painter Oporinus (Herbst), the father of the celebrated professor and printer of Basel.[1] Calvin was exceedingly averse to the union of art with worship,[2] and in this respect was much more rigid than Zwingle, who was not altogether unfavourable to art. But although the *plastic* arts received a check for the time being, or were confined to the prosaic realms of reality, *poetry* and *music*, on the other hand, were cultivated with assiduity and success, especially in their union in religious song. Luther and Zwingle were alike lovers of music. Even in the age of the Reformation, both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches exhibit the names of some very respectable composers. Thus, in the former we have Ludwig Senfl, Hans Walter, and Conrad Rumpf, and in the latter, Claude Goudimel, the musical adapter of the Psalms. That graver style of music which at a later period was reintroduced into the Church by Bach and Handel, is also of Protestant origin. The advantages which accrued to poetry and rhetoric through Luther's living words, through his sermons, his hymns, and his translation of the Bible, need not here be repeated. Nor did Luther stand alone with his harp of Zion. There gathered around him, in his own time and in succeeding ages, a mighty chorus of singers of spiritual songs. We will content ourselves with mentioning the following among those who appeared in the sixteenth century, viz.: Lazarus Spengler (died 1534), Paul Speratus (died 1554), John Gramann (Poliander, died 1541), Nicholas Decius (died 1541), Nicholas Selnecker (died 1592), Paul Eber (died 1562), Erasmus Alber (died 1553), John Schneesing (Chiomusus, died 1567), Nicholas

[1] See Ochs, vol. v. p. 650.

[2] Kampschulte, p. 463; comp., however, Stähelin, ii. p. 393.

Hermann (died 1561); in the Reformed Church appeared Clement Marot (died 1544), who assisted Calvin in the translation of the Psalms, for which Goudimel furnished the melodies.[1]

Finally, we have still to consider that most important topic of the influence of the Reformation upon *morals*. In this connection, if ever, are applicable the words, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Against mere political liberality, as well as against a one-sided scientific enlightenment, it may justly be objected that, in their inordinate endeavour to release men from all authority, they promote the corruption of morals, the licentiousness and audacity of individuals, and thus undermine civil order and the peace and tranquillity of society. This, however, is not the case where the principle of religious reformation has struggled into efficacy. The *moral* regeneration of persons as well as of nations was, as we have constantly had occasion to remark, the real aim of the Reformation. And history shows that this design was in great measure accomplished. How many abuses, perilous to good morals, were done away with![2] How many domestic

[1] On Marot, see C. SCHMIDT's article in Herzog's *Realenc.* ix. p. 115.

[2] It is unjust to cite the numerous instances of coarseness which are to be met with among the Protestants as well as the Catholics of that day, as disproving the efficacy of the Reformation; as unjust as it would be to bring forward the heathenish life of some who live in Christian lands as a proof that Christianity is without effect. Leaven does not at once permeate the mass into which it is introduced, and salvation cannot be forced upon men. The question is simply this: Where the principle of Christian Protestantism came into active operation, did it not exert a beneficial influence over morals? That it did exert such an influence is made manifest by history. As to the fact, for instance, that even the rude military class was religiously affected by the Reformation, comp. BARTHOLD, *G. Frundsberg*, p. 71. More offence than should be given by the rudeness and coarseness which were a heritage from older times, may justly result from the double marriage of the Landgrave Philip, to which Luther himself gave his consent. The occurrence constitutes a proof that the Reformation, at the time of its appearance, did not overcome *all* moral abuses; some excuse for the transaction may be found in that ecclesiastical system of dispensation of which Luther was not the originator. The circumstances of the case were as follows:—Landgrave Philip was endowed with a strong and sensual nature. His wife, Christina of Saxony, who possessed but few charms, had little attraction for him. Philip was unhappy. At the court of his sister, Fräulein von Rochlitz, he made the acquaintance of Margaret von der Saal, a blooming young maiden, for whom he immediately conceived an affection. He was too honour-

and public virtues were called into being! Of the Reformation a twofold moral agency may be predicated—an agency of an external and legal nature, and a higher agency of an internal and evangelical character. Here, as in the preparation of the world for Christianity, it was necessary for the law to open the way for the gospel. The *mandates* of the Reformation were aimed at the abolition of moral effects, the establishment of public decorum, etc., and exhibit an exaggerated severity rather than any levity whatever. But these mandates and sumptuary laws, which, by reason of their very nature, were transitory, do not so well set forth the moral spirit of the Reformation as do those results which were the voluntary products of that spirit. How many lovely traits of humanity, how much bravery and exaltation of mind, what enthusiasm for truth and right, developed side by side with human passions, and in victory over them! The cloisters, which were abolished as useless, were replaced by beneficent associations. In Constance, for instance, there was formed a society of matrons and maidens, who had entered into a sisterly compact to render charitable services to the poor, the sick, the dying,

able to repudiate his wife, but revolved in his mind the question whether it were not possible to have a second wife while he still retained the first. Seeking an answer to this question he opened his Bible, and found that the Patriarchs of the Old Testament, in addition to wives, possessed concubines, and that God did not censure this practice. He therefore asked himself whether, after all, monogamy might not be one of those human ordinances from which the gospel has made us free. In entertaining such a sentiment, Philip set himself in opposition to the laws of his own land. He had introduced into his dominions the criminal code of Charles v., and that code was opposed to bigamy. In his difficulty he applied first to Melander, his court preacher, and to Feige, his chancellor, but subsequently sought opinions from Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer. On the 10th of December 1539, the three theologians furnished an opinion which was exceedingly doubtful and uncertain. Polygamy, it declared, could certainly make no pretension to legal recognition; but in certain cases and by way of exception it might be permitted! Among these exceptional cases they reckoned the case of the landgrave. They advised, however, that the matter should be kept secret, in order that no offence might be given. Accordingly, in 1540, Philip caused Melander to unite him in left-handed marriage to Margaret von der Saal, and Melanchthon was obliged (doubtless with an uneasy conscience) to be present at the ceremony. At first the matter was kept secret, but it gradually transpired, and became the occasion of great scandal and of much invidious remark.

and to widows and orphans. The most distinguished and active of the women thus engaged was Margaret Blarer, a maiden who was as learned as she was pious and benevolent, and who was called by Bullinger the greatest earthly hope of the poor.[1]

In this connection it is fitting that I should say a few words in regard to *schools*. All the Reformers, with scarcely an exception, exerted themselves in behalf of these nurseries of religion and virtue, for they well knew that the seeds of reform must spring up from below. Luther himself declared that if he were not a preacher, he would choose to be a schoolmaster; and to him, in part, the noble calling of the teacher owes the dignity which justly belongs to it. In this solicitude for the prosperity of the school, the period of the Reformation is similar to our own, and one is at first tempted to regard our own time as the more fortunate of the two periods on account of the important progress which it has made in educational matters. Who, indeed, can dispute the fact of this progress? How many prejudices and abuses have been banished from the school since the time of Luther, and what improvements have been made in educational methods! But has not every age its own prejudices, and does it not sometimes seem as if, in putting away old things, we were rejecting much that is good? Is not *culture* often advanced at the expense of *discipline?* When, for instance, we witness the endeavour which is now being openly made to sever all connection between the public school and the Church, to "emancipate" the former, as the saying is,—when we observe that in the education not only of youth, but also in that of the teacher, almost every effort is directed to the

[1] See MÜLLER'S *Relig.* iv. p. 128. The achievements of the Catholic Church in this direction—its associations of Brothers and Sisters of Mercy—should not here be ignored. The Reformation, in its charitable unions as in other respects, did but lead men back to the principles of the ancient Church; or, in other words, to true evangelical principles. In this particular, as in others, however, the Reformation reacted upon the mother Church, inciting it to greater activity.

amassing of knowledge and the cultivation of the intellectual faculties, while moral and religious culture is neglected, the question will suggest itself whether the gain be really as great as we at first supposed. The mere *mass* of knowledge does not release man from the rudeness and sordidness which cling to his nature; the nobler *spirit* which permeates the mass constitutes the true educative, formative element which makes man *man*. Without this nobler spirit of love to God and divine things which Christianity alone is competent to develop in fulness, knowledge truly "puffeth up," and produces a conceited sciolism, whose unripe fruits our age will be long in digesting.

On directing our attention, finally, to *civil and domestic life*, we discover certain facts in regard to diligence, industry, and cleanliness in Protestant countries which force themselves upon the view of the most superficial observer. In consequence of the abolition of superfluous holidays, the suppression of the cloisters, and the discontinuance of ecclesiastical taxes, industry received a mighty impulse. Who was it that improved the condition of manufactures in Switzerland especially, but the Protestants who had been exiled from France and Italy?[1] and where, on the other hand, did the Reformation find more favour than in the industrious imperial and Hanseatic cities of Germany? In Geneva, Calvin himself looked after the opening of new sources of industry, in that he endeavoured to revive the cloth manufacture, which had fallen into decay.[2] Thus the intellectual power which

[1] The Orellis, Muraltos, and others, who were banished from Locarno in 1555, brought with them to Zurich, where their descendants are still flourishing, the art of silk-weaving; they established mills and dye-houses to enable them to pursue their trade, and increased the prosperity of the city (see ZSCHOKKE, *Geschichte des Schweizerlandes*, p. 152). In Basel that branch of industry had already existed for a considerable time, but in this city, also, immigrants belonging to the Reformed Church assisted the older burghers in perfecting the art. The use of the so-called power-looms ([*Kunststühle*] *Bändelmühlinen*) was introduced by Isaac Battier, Jacques de Lachenal, and Fatio, in conjunction with the older families of the Iselins and Hofmanns (see OCHS, vii. p. 357, vi. p. 808).

[2] KAMPSCHULTE, p. 30.

emanated from the Reformation favourably affected even the material well-being of individuals and of cities. May this fact never be forgotten by those who are accustomed to value spiritual good things purely by their earthly results!

The *public amusements* customary among the people were subjected to the discipline of the Church. There were various modes of procedure in this respect, the discipline exercised by Calvin being the most severe. While it pleased Luther that a bride should ornament herself on her wedding day, and be escorted to church with song and music, as the custom was, Calvin abolished all such fashions as heathenish pageantry, and also prohibited dancing. He likewise exhibited the strictness of his ideas in other ways, which need not here be mentioned. It must not, however, be forgotten that Calvin's position in Geneva was different from that of Luther in Wittenberg, and that of Zwingle in Zurich. Much also has been exaggerated by Calvin's critics. Calvin did not deny the people cheerful and decorous recreation any more than did Luther, although he could not take the same genial, personal share in such recreation that was taken by the German Reformer or by Œcolampadius, the latter of whom once accompanied his people from Basel to Liestal to a church festival, and there delivered a suitable sermon. Calvin endeavoured to put a check upon the attendance at the taverns by establishing Christian casinos in the various districts of the town, of which there were five. These casinos, or abbeys, as they were called, were placed under the supervision of special clerical and secular officers. A regulation, published in May 1546, accurately determined the requisite conduct of both host and guest.[1] A criterion of the relative severity or laxity of the moral code of a community is furnished by the attitude of that community in regard to the *drama* and matters connected therewith. It is well known that Luther entertained very liberal sentiments on the subject of comedies. He did not think that they need be entirely

[1] KAMPSCHULTE, p. 446; STÄHELIN, i. p. 371.

avoided, simply because they occasionally present improprieties. He himself took pleasure in the comedies of Plautus and Terence. But Calvin also, in the spring of 1546, allowed some respectable burghers to perform a moral play. At this representation the whole burghership was present. It even took place on a Sunday, and the regular afternoon service was omitted for its sake. Soon afterwards, however, Michael Cop, another Genevese preacher, attacked the drama from the pulpit, and Calvin found himself obliged to take the part of the preacher.[1] Plays were then prohibited, and the Reformed Church was for a long time more severe in its judgment of them than was the Lutheran Church.

Finally, *domestic life* was enriched by the Reformation, which gave depth and durability to the home affections. In proportion as religion ceased to be a mere external thing and made itself felt as a power in the soul, the fairer could be the growth of the household virtues. When the mother of a family knew that she could serve God better in the circle of her loved ones than in church at the daily mass—when parents realized that in giving their children a Christian training at home they were conferring upon them a greater benefit than if they placed them in a cloister, the invisible altar of domestic order and virtue could be securely reared upon the foundation of the word of God, which the house father taught his family to revere, and instead of lifeless pictures there appeared the lovely, living picture of a holy family circle. The share which the suppression of celibacy had in elevating the dignity of married life and in humanly ennobling the clerical order, and the examples left us by the Reformers in the capacities of husbands and fathers, have already been noticed.

As might be expected, the Protestant *family*, like the Protestant school, was most closely connected with the Church, and bore a strictly confessional stamp. The age of the Reformation recognised neither mixed schools nor mixed

[1] STÄHELIN, i. p. 393.

marriages. In this respect old Protestantism was fully as strict as Roman Catholicism. Calvin declared that it was a "desecration of the family" for a man to marry a woman "who was infected with the godless superstition of Papistry."[1] Could he judge otherwise in his time and from his standpoint? Our own age boasts of its large-heartedness and liberality in this respect, and we must admit that, circumstances being altered, the old views can no longer be unconditionally retained. But, as contrasted with the levity with which our advanced period overleaps religious considerations, and the thoughtlessness of its general treatment of matrimonial affairs, the views of the Reformers have manifestly still right on their side. We must, furthermore, consider the spirit rather than the letter of their regulations. The spirit of the Reformation, in its severe as well as its milder manifestations, was the spirit of discipline, of order, of the fear of God, of subordination to God's purposes of salvation, as revealed in His word, and flowing from His divine love, wisdom, and righteousness. It is true that each of the Reformers interpreted these laws after the measure of his own understanding of them. That understanding, however, always reposed upon a solid foundation.

Before closing this chapter, we must mention some of the tendencies which, in respect both to doctrine and to principles of action, departed from the principles of the Reformers and essayed other paths. Not all who were at variance with the ancient Church and her statutes, agreed with Luther, Zwingle, or Calvin. Subjectivism was already asserting itself in opposition to what Protestantism laid down as dogmas, as infrangible laws of faith and morals. Mention has already been made of the Anabaptist, the Antitrinitarian, and the Libertine tendency. To these we shall not recur.[2] We must

[1] KAMPSCHULTE, p. 462 (*Epp. et resp.* 216B, 217A).

[2] Distinguished among the Anabaptists was Melchior Hofmann, a furrier; he was a native of Swabia, but early turned his face northwards, and at the commencement of the Reformation was residing in Livonia. In 1525 he was in Wittenberg, but went thence to Dorpat, and from the latter place he repaired

speak, however, of a few persons who, without joining the sects and parties referred to, pursued their own individual ways. Two men there are in particular who here deserve consideration — viz., Caspar Schwenkfeldt and Sebastian Franck.

Caspar Schwenkfeldt was descended from the noble family of Von Ossigk in Silesia. He was born in 1490, and passed his youth at different Saxon courts. When the Reformation began to spread over Germany, he was sojourning at the court of Frederick II. of Liegnitz. At an earlier period he had, like Luther, become acquainted with Tauler's writings, and had drunk deep at the fountain of German mysticism. In 1522 he went to Wittenberg and made the acquaintance of Carlstadt. He preached in religious assemblies, but soon adopted other principles than those advanced by Luther, and even declared openly that nothing was further from his intention than to accept everything that Luther taught. Luther's fundamental doctrine, the doctrine of justification by faith, occasioned him practical scruples. He had observed, he said, that people who had embraced this doctrine were morally not one whit better than when they were Papists. He did not oppose the doctrine in itself, else, as he admitted, he must have fought against the Apostle Paul. But the one-sided emphasizing thereof, the thrusting of sanctification behind justification, he could not approve. He maintained that by faith we are not only assured of the forgiveness of sins, but are translated into

to Reval. He preached for some time in Stockholm, and afterwards (after 1520) in Strassburg. He led in general an unsettled and roving life. His views of Christ's incarnation were similar to those of Schwenkfeldt. He held that the eternal Word did not *take* flesh *of* or *from* Mary, but (literally) *became* flesh. The accursed flesh of Adam could neither have redeemed us nor have been to us food unto eternal life. He also opposed the Lutheran doctrine of justification, claiming that it nourished a false security. Although he rejected infant baptism (maintaining that it was of the devil), he withdrew from the Anabaptists, because, as he said, "there were many rogues among them." As he did not cease to revile the Evangelical preachers, a suit was instituted against him at Strassburg, and he was imprisoned. He was not put to death, but gradually sank into oblivion. David Joris of Delft, and Menno Simonis, the Reformer of the Anabaptists, will be noticed hereafter.

the divine essence itself.[1] Schwenkfeldt found it as impossible to reconcile himself to the so-called material principle of the Reformation as to adopt its formal principle. He had, it is true, a high esteem for the Scriptures, but he did not consider them identical with the word of God. The word of God he regarded as something living and intrinsic, something not held captive in the letter of Scripture. On the course of this word (*De cursu verbi Dei*) he composed a tractate, which, with other writings, he sent to Œcolampadius, who wrote a preface to it (1527). Schwenkfeldt vigorously attacked the external religiosity and self-sufficiency of the Protestant clergy, who took refuge behind Luther's name to conceal their own nakedness. "The Lutheran preachers," he complains, "have arrived at such a pitch that they ascribe all that they do, in the exercise of their ministry, to God and the Lord Christ, whether their action be right or wrong, good or bad. Be the preacher a godly or an ungodly man, all that he utters from the pulpit must be the work of God—nay, God and the Lord Christ must, it is claimed, be co-agents with him; and thus little distinction is made between the external service of God and His internal operation and power, between the Lord and the servant, between the sign and the thing signified, between God and the creature, and, furthermore, between the oral word of the preacher and the saving word of God." "The most painful circumstance of all," he continues, "is that they [the Lutheran clergy] are withal so secure and arrogant that, disregarding all the impiety of the present day, they persuade themselves and boast that since the time of the apostles the condition of Christendom has never been better than at present. To hear them, one would think that all that should be done had already been accomplished. We scarcely have come out of Egypt, and perhaps have not yet passed through the Red

[1] He regarded faith as "an actual communication of God's essence to man, a gracious gift of the divine essence, a drop of the heavenly fountain, a ray of the eternal sun, a spark of the burning fire that God is, a communion and participation in the divine nature and essence."

Sea; yet they think that we already have the promised land in possession, and they are therefore exerting all their energies to maintain the honour of their doctrines, in order that no division or heresy may assail them. Hence they would also bind all men to Dr. Martin's expositions of the Scriptures, just as the Papists would fain have the Bible understood solely in accordance with the pope's interpretation thereof; and as Paul ventured not to speak or to undertake anything without being confident that Christ was working through him, so these preachers would have us say nothing in religious matters except what would please Luther. If, however, they should gain their point, and if we, in our reading of the Scriptures, should thus be driven away from our Master Christ and from His doctrine, and obliged to extol all the ways of men like ourselves, we would indeed be more miserable than we were under the Papacy." Schwenkfeldt had his own peculiar views on the subject of the Lord's Supper also, and set forth a new interpretation of the sacramental words.[1]

Schwenkfeldt's doctrines were embraced by others, among whom were Fabian Eckel, preacher at Liegnitz, and Valentine Krautwald, a canon and lecturer of the chapter of St. John in the same city. Luther treated Krautwald as a fanatic, styled him Stenkfeld in contempt, and called him "a nonsensical fool who is possessed by the devil, and neither understands nor knows what he babbles."[2] In 1528 Schwenkfeldt was obliged to leave the land of his birth. He went first to Strassburg, and next repaired to Swabia, which was already receptive of eccentric tendencies in religion. At least Schwenkfeldt succeeded in gaining some adherents in that country. But opponents arose against him even there. He was attacked at Ulm by his former friend Frecht, and was banished from that city, where he had remained for some time. Brenz and

[1] He referred τοῦτο to the bread, thus changing the subject of the sentence into the predicate. The meaning of the words according to him would be: "My body is bread" (bread of life).

[2] "To Kaspar Schwenkfeldt's messenger" (a letter of the year 1543), De Wette, v. No. 2185.

Andreæ also wrote against him, and Melanchthon[1] and the Swiss Reformers Vadian and Bullinger likewise opposed him. He found it necessary to issue a vindication of his tenets, which he sent to all the noted theologians of Germany and Switzerland. His doctrine was formally condemned at the convention in Schmalkalden in 1540, and he himself was nowhere tolerated, but was obliged to wander from place to place until his death, which occurred at Ulm on the 10th of December 1561. Notwithstanding the peculiar opinions of this man, his moral character was irreproachable; his deep piety necessarily made a deep impression upon every unprejudiced person, and his adherents, the "Schwenkfeldters," were for the most part good people. Schwenkfeldt did not cease to treat his opponents with meekness, and to pray for them when they cursed him. He was persecuted solely for his heresy. Besides the points already mentioned, this heresy consisted especially in his peculiar Christological views. He taught that we should behold in Christ not simply "God in the flesh," but also "the flesh in God," and spoke of the "deified flesh" of the Redeemer.[2]

We have before remarked that new paths in philosophy were opened by other men than the Reformers. Sebastian Franck, who was born at Donauwörth in Swabia, about the year 1500, was one of the pioneers to whom we refer. Hagen[3] speaks of him as one by whom the true spirit of the Reformation was not only received and represented, but also carried forward, so that he appears both as the representative of the Reforming tendency and as the forerunner of a new development of the human mind, as the man "in whom the ideas of modern philosophy were already existing in germ." Most of his contemporaries entertained a less favourable opinion of him. Luther called him "a blasphemer, the peculiar and

[1] *Corp. Ref.* viii. pp. 159, 285, 562, 633.

[2] HAHN, *Schwenkfeldii sententia de Christi persona et opere exposita*, 1847; EGELHAAF, *Geschichte der protestantischen Secten im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Hamburg, 1848; HERZOG'S *Realenc.* xiv. pp. 130 sqq.

[3] *Geist der Reformation und seine Gegensätze*, vol. ii. p. 314.

favourite mouthpiece of the devil, a fanatic who cares for nothing but spirit, spirit, spirit, and understands nought of word and sacrament." He was certainly a man in whose breast there burned, besides the nobler flame of Mysticism, a wild, strange fire, and who on more than one occasion pantheistically confounded God and the universe. God and the universe he regarded as co-eternal; it is in the creature alone that God becomes truly God, he asserted. God is everywhere and nowhere. He is neither this nor that, but an eternal and infinite Thing and Good, without a name. He is all in all. There is nothing so small that God is not in it; there is nothing so great as to be able to embrace and encircle God. There is nothing so small that God is not still smaller, nothing so great that God is not greater.[1] This system of Franck's necessarily involved all sorts of antitheses. Everything, he declared, is good or bad according to the manner in which it is regarded. All things are in a state of eternal fluxion, in a constant round of appearing and disappearing. Sin and the punishment thereof are vanishing points in this process. This theory does away with the idea of moral responsibility, and discards at the same time the doctrines of the forgiveness of sins, redemption, justification, and sanctification, which together form the Evangelical system of salvation.[2] Franck highly esteemed the Bible, but placed the book of nature on a par with it. The book of nature he regarded as the living Bible, which preaches more eloquently than the dead letters of Scripture. He did not regard Scripture and the word of God as synonymous terms. Concerning the word of God, he entertained ideas similar to those of Schwenkfeldt, regarding it primarily as the intrinsic word, written by God in our hearts and inborn in us. According to him, the word did

[1] See the passages in WACKERNAGEL'S *Lesebuch* (Prose, i.), pp. 345, 346; HAGEN, *l.c.* On the man and his writings, see C. A. HASE, *Sebastian Franck von Wörd, der Schwarmgeist*, Leipsic, 1869.

[2] HAGEN (p. 356) calls Franck the first among the moderns "who earnestly combated the *ridiculous* (!) idea of sin against God." To the Reformers that idea was not at all ridiculous. Comp., however, HASE, *l.c.* p. 181.

not become flesh but *once;* it is continually humanizing itself in us. It is not bound to the "travis" of Scripture. Scripture is like the reed, the envelope, the lantern which bears the light, but is not itself the light, the monstrance in which "the sacred thing, *i.e.* Christ (God's word), is enclosed and borne." All positivism, basing itself upon the letter of Scripture, this spiritualistic Reformer abhorred as dead Pharisaism. In political matters, also, his sympathies were not with the written law, transmitted through the pages of history, but with the law of nature which is born with us. His ideas, though peculiar to himself, touch upon Communism.[1] He was also opposed to the system of church establishment, and blamed Luther for basing so many of his expectations in behalf of Christianity upon princes. With acute irony he wrote: "If the sovereign be Evangelical, it rains Christians; but if a Nero succeed your Evangelical prince, God help us! the Christians all vanish, and away flies Sir Omnes, like gnats in the winter."

Franck led an unsettled life. We find him in different cities of Upper Germany, in Nuremberg, Strassburg, and Ulm. He was connected with Schwenkfeldt and also with men of the Reformation; with the latter, however, he soon fell out, his ways being utterly at variance with theirs. He was unwilling, however, to be called a sectarian, and in fact opposed sectarianism as decidedly as the Roman Papacy, and everything connected therewith. He had his own ideas and stood upon his own feet, and therefore was obliged to battle his way with his own arm. He endeavoured to procure his daily bread by the

[1] "The common God, in accordance with His nature, from the beginning made all things common, pure, and free. It is doubtless our duty to hold all things in common, even as sunshine, air, rain, snow, and water are common to all. As many children in the house of one father possess a common undivided property, so must every one esteem it just that in this great house of God's world we should fairly enjoy in common those good things which He showers in common upon us all, putting them into our hands and lending them to us only as guests. But owing to our perverted nature it has come to pass that this pure holding of things in common is pronounced impure." On Franck's Communism comp. DETHLOFF'S *Programm*, Schwerin, 1850; and HASE, *l.c.* pp. 134 sqq.

work of his hands, after the apostolic fashion, and was sometimes a soap-boiler, sometimes a printer, and sometimes a turner. On being banished from Ulm, he found an asylum in Basel, where he died about the year 1543. In addition to his philosophical work (*Paradoxa*), his *Golden Ark*, his *Book sealed with Seven Seals*, and sundry popular pamphlets, his most noted works are his *Chronica, Zeitbuch und Geschichtsbibel*, and his *Weltbuch* ("Cosmography"), in both of which there is no lack of all sorts of marvels. He is the first, or among the first, by whom a history of the world was written in German.

Opposition to Protestant orthodoxy, such as we have met with in the case of Schwenkfeldt and Sebastian Franck, sometimes had the effect of leading the opposer back to the ancient Church, to whose authority he would finally prefer to submit rather than accept the doctrines of the Wittenberg theologians. Instances of such retrogression are furnished us by Theobald Thamer and George Wicel.

Thamer was an Alsatian, a native of Rosenheun (Rosshain?) in Lower Alsace; he, however, received his education at Wittenberg. At the latter city, Landgrave Philip of Hesse became interested in him and induced him to remove to Marburg, where he occupied a professorship during the years 1543–49. He served in the Schmalkaldic War as a chaplain, but the sad experience which he then acquired in regard to the dissolute life of the people, made him doubt the moral power of the doctrine of justification. Especially repugnant to him was the stress which the Lutheran party laid upon the word *sola*. A faith destitute of good works he regarded (in accordance with the teaching of the Apostle James) as a dead faith. Living faith, he contended, must be apprehended not as bare historic credence, but as faithfulness, faithfulness to conviction (*fidelitas*). He also combated the deification of the letter of the Bible. We are reminded of subsequent rationalism by Thamer's teaching that the Bible must find its corroboration in the reason and conscience of man; he, however, dis-

tinguished two sorts of conscience, the human and the divine conscience, corresponding to the human and the divine natures in the person of the Redeemer. He held that the redemptive efficacy of Christ consisted not in His vicarious death, but in His doctrine and the example which He left us.

After Thamer was obliged to leave Frankfort-on-the-Main, he proceeded to Switzerland, bearing recommendations from Landgrave Philip. Bullinger hoped to be able to induce him to return to the right way, but was disappointed in his expectations. Thamer would listen to no advice. Bullinger laments over him as follows:—"He was so contumacious and unruly, screaming and refusing to hear the friendly counsel which was given him, that we agreed that we had never met with so disorderly a man, or one on whom our kindly efforts were more completely thrown away."[1] From Zurich, Thamer repaired to Milan, and thence proceeded to Rome. At the latter city he formally returned to the Catholic religion, which agreed with his conception of faith and works better than the Protestant doctrine. He was at last appointed to a professorship at Freiburg, in Breisgau, and died on the 23d of May 1569.[2]

The case of George Wicel was similar to the above. He was the son of an innkeeper of Vach, in Hesse, and "a very learned and able man," according to the testimony of his contemporaries. He discharged the office of preacher at Niemegk near Wittenberg, and was specially concerned in the peace negotiations at Regensburg. Some have even regarded him as the author of the interim, but this supposition is incorrect. Wicel's ideas of Reform moved in the sphere of Erasmus and the Humanists rather than in that of Luther. The doctrine of justification was particularly offensive to him, as was also the abuse of the term "faith," prevalent even in his time. He spoke with virulence of the Evangelical preachers, calling

[1] PESTALOZZI, *l.c.* p. 464.

[2] NEANDER, *Theobald Thamer, Repräsentant und Vorgänger moderner Geistesrichtungen*, Berlin, 1842.

them two-legged foxes and boars, that spoil the vineyard of the Lord, crying and writing ever: "Believe! believe! believe!" What wonder is it that Luther, in his turn, called Wicel a serpent, "a faithless varlet, a most venomous and bitter fanatic!" As early as 1531, Wicel had returned to the Catholic Church. He entered the service of John, abbot of Fulda, to whom he dedicated the work which he composed in 1540.[1] He occupied himself in his learned seclusion with hymnological studies, and died in March 1573.

But not only from dogmatical reasons were these returns to the Catholic Church. Many, of whom history gives no record, may have fallen away from the faith of the gospel from sheer inconstancy, or from motives of human fear or favour. *One* instance of such apostasy, and of the remorse which succeeded it, is, however, preserved to us in the history of Francis Spiera, an Italian. Spiera was a lawyer and advocate, a native of the little town of Citadella, near Padua. He had there committed many offences which were a burden to his conscience. About the year 1542, he was brought to an acknowledgment of the truths of the gospel. His recognition of Evangelical truth seemed, however, to effect no moral change in him. On the contrary, he himself confesses that he placed his whole confidence in the merit of Christ in order that he might sin on unhindered, and he further states that he most culpably abused Evangelical liberty, turning it into licentiousness. Notwithstanding this, he felt himself called to preach the gospel in the public streets and market-places. No long time elapsed before he was accused of heresy before the Papal legate, Della Casa, at Venice, and after undergoing some mental conflict, he made a public recantation of the Evangelical doctrine. His conscience then began to upbraid him. But the weakness of the flesh once more triumphed over the spirit of Spiera. Having returned to his birth-place, Citadella, he recanted, in the presence of the magistrate, the clergy, and

[1] *Typus ecclesiæ prioris.* Comp. NEANDER, *Dr. Georgio Wicelio*, Berol, 1839.

great numbers of the people, all that he had formerly confessed and taught, and was then, after paying a fine of thirty ducats, received back to the bosom of the Catholic Church. Scarcely, however, had he returned to his house, when he experienced the most fearful torments of conscience. He seemed to hear a voice saying to him: "Wretch! thou hast denied me: depart from me into eternal damnation!" Still tortured by the pangs of conscience, he removed with his family to Padua. There he sank into the deepest melancholy, and lay upon his bed, struggling with despair. Physicians were summoned. But what could they avail? Even Evangelical friends who visited him, among whom were Piedro Paolo Vergerio and one Dr. Gribaldi, were able to effect nothing with their words of counsel and consolation. To the comforting passages of Scripture which they repeated to him, he always opposed other passages which condemned him. Even the intercessions addressed to God in his behalf by his friends appeared to him as manifestly of no avail. On several occasions he attempted to take his own life, and was forcibly prevented from accomplishing his purpose. Unimproved and hopeless, he returned to Citadella, where, a few days after his arrival, he died, without having attained to inward peace. The impression which the hell-like torments of the despairing man made upon those who witnessed them or heard of them (Protestants as well as Catholics), was most profound. "Truly," said Vergerio, when he beheld Spiera's sufferings at Padua, "if the students do not forsake all the lectures to gaze upon this tragedy, their sensibilities must be exceedingly obtuse."[1]

We shall now take a brief survey of the Romish Church itself, as it existed in the midst of the struggle of the Reformation. Of the resistance which it opposed to the Reformers, and of partial attempts to reunite to itself those who had separated from it, we have already treated in the foregoing narrative of facts. We have made the acquaintance not only

[1] SIXT, *Paulus Vergerius*, pp. 125 sqq.; CHRISTOFFEL, *Lebens und Leidensbilder*, pp. 99 sqq.

of fanatical defenders of inveterate abuses and of positive obscurants; besides such, we have found in the old Church men of enlightenment and scientific culture, and—what is of more consequence to us—we have also met with noble, pious Romanists, men accessible by truth, and who were not far removed from an Evangelical conviction, men to whom we could not but accord our respect and affection. But the measures taken by the Church in general, to stem the inrushing tide of innovation, to lead the current of popular movement into its own channels, to vitalize and refresh Catholicism, are well worthy of special consideration in a separate chapter.

CHAPTER XXXV.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION—THE COUNCIL OF TRENT—NEW MONASTIC ORDERS: CAPUCHINS, PAULINES (BARNABITES), THEATINES, SOMASKERS—IGNATIUS LOYOLA AND THE JESUITS—NEW SAINTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH—PHILIP NERI—PETER OF ALCANTARA — SAINT THERESA—THE ROMISH INQUISITION—THE GREEK CHURCH IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION.

THERE were two lines of conduct which it was necessary for the old Church to pursue in reference to the innovations which had made their appearance. On the one hand, it was requisite that the Romish Church should arrest the spread of the Lutheran, Zwinglian, and Calvinistic Reformations, and that it should also suppress those heresies which were travelling on their own independent ways. On the other hand, again, it was imperative that the Church should manifest an earnest purpose on its own part to effect the reformation for which men had been waiting since long before the appearance of Luther. It was necessary for the Church to examine and collect its resources—to balance its accounts, as it were. In short, it could not ignore the Reformation; it must assume a definite position in regard to that movement; it must arrive at a final understanding with it. It was impossible that the Catholicism of the Middle Ages should simply go on its way as though nothing had occurred. A *modern* Catholicism came into being, forming a conscious antithesis to Protestantism. It is not our purpose here to relate the history of this modern Catholicism. We shall content ourselves with some few intimations concerning it.

The revival of the shaken Church was effected at the Œcumenical Council of Trent. Its fresh uprising was, however, assisted in an important degree by the new Monastic Orders which were founded during the period of the Reformation, and above all by the Order of the Jesuits. The increased vigour manifested by the Romish Church was, however, the result not merely of legal regulations and institutions, but also of the zeal of individuals like Ignatius Loyola and other less noted ascetics, who proved that there was still resident in the old Church an impulsive power which might be productive of new saints, according to that Church's understanding of saintship. It is to the three points here indicated that we propose to direct our attention.

Of the Council of Trent[1] we have already heard, in the foregoing history of the Reformation frequent reference having been made to it. Paul III. having in March 1544 designated the time of the Council's assembly, at the appointed season the Papal legates, Cardinal del Monte (afterwards Pope Julius III.) and Servino, together with Diego Mendoza, the imperial envoy, arrived at Trent for the purpose of making the necessary preparations. On the 13th of December 1545, nearly a year after the time fixed upon for the beginning of the Council, it was solemnly opened, although there were present not more than twenty-five bishops (among whom were four archbishops). From the Church of the Trinity, where the assembly had convened, the procession, which consisted of four generals of orders, a few abbots, and some other ecclesiastical dignitaries, in addition to the bishops, moved to the cathedral. There mass was read by Cardinal del Monte. Cornelio Musso, bishop of Bitonto, then preached a sermon, which was both devoid of taste and

[1] Besides the writings of Sarpi and Pallavicini, comp. BUNGENER, *Histoire du Concile de Trente*, ii., Paris, 1847; RANKE, both his *Hist. of the Reformation* and his *Hist. of the Popes*; GIESELER, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii. 2, pp. 505 sqq.; H. SCHMIDT, in Herzog's *Realenc.* xvi. pp. 369 sqq.

offensive in its character.[1] Then, after singing of the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, the synod was declared to be opened "for the glory of the Holy Trinity, for the extirpation of heresies, for the restoration of the peace and unity of the Church, for the reformation of the clergy and the laity, and for the destruction of all enemies of the Christian name." The singing of the *Te Deum Laudamus* concluded the solemnities. The actual sessions of the Council did not begin until 7th January 1546. It is these first sessions which have the most important bearing upon our narrative, because in them, especially in the fourth session and the sessions immediately succeeding it, the system of belief and doctrine of the Catholic Church was established, in antithesis to the Protestant dogmas. This, however, was not effected without much opposition from some of the members of the assembly. Thus, there was resistance to the establishment of the tenet that tradition should be received as equally authoritative with Scripture. This proposition was opposed by Bishop Nachianti of Chiozza, and Antonio Marinari, a Carmelite monk, both of whom were desirous that Scripture alone should be recognised as authoritative. They, however, yielded at last to the opinion of the majority.[2] In regard to the Holy Scriptures, there was prepared a catalogue of the canonical books, in which catalogue (in opposition to the practice of the Protestants) the Apocrypha of the Old Testament were included.[3] Furthermore (although some few voices were raised against this measure likewise),

[1] There was a lack of taste in the bishop's comparison of the Council to the Trojan horse, and calling upon the clergy to allow themselves to be enclosed in its belly. There was a lack of taste in the preacher's apostrophe to the woods and fields of Trent, inviting them to hearken to the doctrine of the pope's infallibility. Actually offensive, however, was the speaker's declaration that it was of no consequence whether the clergy were possessed of moral worth or not, and that if they only opened their hearts to receive the Spirit of God as the parched earth receives the rain, the Divine Spirit could even now speak through them as formerly He spoke through Balaam and Caiaphas.

[2] Bishop Nachianti made use of the word *obediam* only, and not *placet*, in expressing his assent to the doctrine in question.

[3] Luther, as is well known, did not exclude these books from his translation of the Bible, but he made a distinction between them and the canonical books.

the Vulgate was recognised as the authentic translation of the Scriptures, and the one that should be used in sermons and disputations. The right to interpret Scripture was accorded to the Church alone. It was thought necessary to establish this fundamental tenet in order to restrain individual caprice.[1]

In the discussion of the doctrines of original sin and justification, the above-mentioned Carmelite, Marinari, gave vent to some utterances which closely approached the Protestant conceptions. Catharinus, a Dominican monk, and Seripandus, an Augustinian, also expressed similar ideas. The Archbishop of Siena, Bishop della Cava, and Giulio Contarini, bishop of Belluno, likewise ascribed justification solely to the merits of Christ, and to faith in Him.[2] Notwithstanding this, however, justification, as a making just or righteous, was by the Council associated with sanctification, in antithesis to Protestantism, which separates the two. The necessity of good works was also emphatically set forth. In addition to the difference of Catholicism and Protestantism, the old questions of dispute between the Franciscans and Dominicans were occasionally revived, and the synod was unable to settle them. Nor did the assembly venture to pronounce a final decision concerning the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary, but suffered it to remain as the former deliverances of the Church had left it. The sacraments were declared to be seven in number, and every increase or diminution of that number was anathematized. There were also regulations made which concerned the internal constitution of the Church, and in the making of these regulations, the Papal See was careful to permit no encroachment upon its authority through compliance with the demands urged upon it.

We have already mentioned that in the year 1547 the pope endeavoured to remove the Council to Bologna, but was strenuously opposed by the emperor. It was not until

[1] "Ad coërcenda petulantia ingenia."
[2] RANKE, *Röm. Päpste*, i. p. 202.

Julius III. had succeeded Paul III. on the throne of the Papacy that the Council was reopened at Trent, on the 1st of May 1551. It was thenceforth presided over by Cardinal S. Marcelli, Crescentius, who guarded the Romish interests in all points, and set his face most positively against every demand for reform. He was supported by James Lainez and Alphonso Salmeron, "as Papal theologians." The names of these two men will appear again in our notice of the founding of the Jesuit Order. In this session of the Council the article relating to the sacraments was again considered. The doctrine of transubstantiation and the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass were confirmed. In April 1552 another adjournment of the Council was rendered necessary by the occurrences of the times, and especially by the advance of the Elector Maurice. There were no further sessions for a period of ten years, but the Council was again opened in the year 1562, during the pontificate of Pius IV., and was finally closed on the 4th of December 1563. The last two dates have carried us beyond our chronological limits.

We shall now turn to a consideration of the new Orders which came into being during the age of the Reformation, in spite of the opposition which Monachism was then undergoing.

We mention first the Order of the Capuchins. A strange, almost comical air clings to the narrative of its origin. It is related that Matteo de Bassi, a Minorite of the Strict Observance, residing in the monastery of Monte Falco, near Urbino (in the States of the Church), had a vision, in which St. Francis of Assisi, the founder of the Minorite Order, appeared to him and informed him that a pointed hood [or *capuccio*] and a beard terminating in a point were necessary to complete the habit of the Franciscan Order. De Bassi and his colleague, Luigi de Fossombrone, immediately assumed hoods of the required form, and hence received the name of Capucini [hooded men] from the street boys of Ancona, who ran after them, attracted by their novel costume. We may

content ourselves with the simple fact that De Bassi and De Fossombrone are to be regarded as the founders of the Capuchin Order, which is, after all, only a branch of the Franciscan Order. Pope Clement VII., in 1526, conferred upon these two monks permission to retain the above-described costume, and to lead the life of rigorous recluses, on condition that they annually presented themselves before the Provincial Chapter of the Observants. The Duchess of Camerino, a niece of the pope, interested herself in them, and—through the influence of her husband the Duke—they were, in 1527, admitted as hermit-brethren "to the allegiance and protection of the Conventuals." On the 18th of July 1528, the pope published a bull regulating further particulars in regard to the Order.[1] The first monastery of the Capuchins was that of Calmenzono, which was presented to them by the Duchess of Camerino. Their first chapter was held at Alvacina, and was presided over by Luigi de Fossombrone. The statutes of the Order were formulated on this occasion. The Capuchins were a regular mendicant Order; they were not permitted, however, to beg more than would suffice them for a single day. Frequent prayer and the most rigid abstemiousness and asceticism (including flagellation) were enjoined upon them. Like the Franciscans, they had their vicar-general, who was chosen every three years by the chapter, their provincials, custodians, and guardians. The Capuchins were distinguished for their unquestioning devotion to the service of the Church, and for their self-sacrificing spirit. At the time of their origin, the plague prevailed in Italy, and they were pre-eminently active in caring for those stricken by the disease; they shunned no danger of contagion in bearing the consolations of religion to the sick, in administering the sacraments to the dying, and in consigning the bodies of the dead to consecrated earth.

As popular preachers, the Capuchins hindered the progress of the Reformation among the masses. From this Order, how-

[1] They then received the name of *Fratres Minores Capucini*, or *Capucini Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*.

ever, as from that of the Franciscans, some men went forth who added the weight of their influence to the Reformatory movement. One such individual was Bernardino Occhino. In the year 1534 he quitted the Order of the Observants for that of the Capuchins, after entering which he distinguished himself as a powerful preacher of repentance, and was subsequently (1538, 1541) elected vicar-general. In consequence, however, of his vigorous assailment of the Papal religion and his earnest efforts in the cause of Evangelical liberty, he was obliged to seek refuge in Geneva. He afterwards married, and passed through a variety of fortunes. In addition to the male Order of the Capuchins, there was an Order of Capuchin Nuns, founded by Maria Laurentia Longa. They were governed by the rules of the Clares.[1]

In the year 1530, a few pious ecclesiastics[2] united for the purpose of establishing an association which should care for the neglected and destitute in time of war, and which should be ready to perform foreign or domestic missionary service. Clement VII. sanctioned this association in 1532, and Duke Francis Sforza accorded to the members thereof permission to purchase real estate in his territory. Paul III. released them from the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishops, and placed them under the immediate authority of the Roman See. Their society was entitled, The Congregation of Regular Clerks of St. Paul (1535). From that time they were called Paulines. When, in 1545, they removed their residence to the church of St. Barnabas in Milan, they received the name of Barnabites. Their Order spread through the rest of Italy, and they deserved much credit for their efforts in behalf of the instruction of youth.

By means of the Reformation, the moral evils not only of monachism, but also of the secular clergy, had been brought to light. It was high time that something should be done from

[1] [The Order of Franciscan Nuns.—Tr.]

[2] Their names were Antonio Maria Zacharia, Bartolomeo Ferari, and Giacomo Antonio Morigia; they were afterwards joined by others.

the Catholic standpoint for the elevation and moral improvement of the last-mentioned class. The idea of such a reform suggested itself to the mind of Gaëtano (Cajetan) of Thienne, in the Venetian territory. Gaëtano, who was an extremely gentle and peace-loving man, was by his modesty prevented from pushing himself forward as a reformer. It was his desire "to reform the world without any person being aware that he himself was in the world."[1] He was frequently seen to shed tears over the prayers which he offered for the welfare of the Church. But he wished to *do* something himself for its prosperity, and consulted with his friends in regard to the matter. One of these friends was Peter de Caraffa, who was afterwards Pope Paul IV., but at the time of which we speak was still bishop of Chiati; he was ordinarily called, in the Neapolitan dialect, Theate, from his bishopric (Chiati). In character he was the opposite of Gaëtano, being impetuous and passionate; the two, however, leagued themselves together in their deeply-felt need of a reformation of the Church. They both relinquished their lucrative positions, and, in company with a few other friends, retired from society. They lived together on the Pincian Hill, near Rome, in poverty and in the practice of strict devotion. They disdained to beg, and awaited at home the benefactions which good people conferred upon them. In honour of Theate, the Order received the appellation of Theatines. On the 24th of June 1524, it was sanctioned by Clement VII. The members of this Order took upon themselves the obligation of absolute poverty, and applied themselves to preaching and the cure of souls (especially among the sick and prisoners), and also performed missionary work, particularly in Tartary, Georgia, and Circassia.

Another benevolent Order whose rise was connected with the reformatory efforts of Catholicism, was that of the Somaskers (Somaschers). Since the year 1521, Upper Italy had been afflicted with incessant war, and, in consequence thereof, with desolation, famine, and disease. A multitude of

[1] RANKE, *Römische Päpste*, i. p. 174.

orphaned children, who, in the providence of God, had been driven to Venice, lay uncared for about the streets of that city, their bodies and souls being alike in danger of perishing. The miserable condition of these little ones excited the compassion of a noble Venetian senator, Hieronymus Æmilius by name, or, as he was usually called, Girolamo Miani. Renouncing his luxurious mode of life, Miani exchanged the senatorial purple for a frock which he had intended to bestow upon a beggar,[1] and clad in this garb he went as a poor man among the poor. In his gondola he traversed the canals of Venice for the purpose of gathering together destitute children under his own fatherly protection. He next sold the silver plate which he possessed and the handsomest carpets of his apartments, in order to provide his nurslings with lodging, food, and raiment, and, above all, with good instruction. A house near the church of St. Roque, in Venice, was converted into an Orphan Asylum. Nor was the noble councillor satisfied with this achievement. He did not rest until refuges for similar unfortunates were established all through Upper Italy. Wherever sacrifices were required, Miani led the way with his noble example. He erected an hospital at Bergamo. Similar institutions arose at Verona, Brescia, Ferrara, Como, Milan, Pavia, and Genoa. To ensure still further success to the undertaking, and at the same time to give it an ecclesiastical foundation, Miani united with some friends in forming a religious congregation, which, after the model of the Theatines, was composed of regular clerics. From the city of Somaska, near Lake Lucco, these received the name of Somaskers. The Order obtained the Papal sanction in 1540,[2] and afterwards became the recipients of further privileges.

While the Orders which we have just mentioned, with the exception of the Capuchins and Theatines, are unknown, even by name, to the majority of cultured Protestants (who ever

[1] HELYOT, *Histoire des ordres monastiques*, iv. p. 241.

[2] The Order was subsequently entitled, The Order of St. Majolus, from a church in Pavia consecrated to that saint which was presented to the Somaskers.

hears now of Barnabites or Somaskers?), the name Jesuit is in every one's mouth. And yet many connect a highly unhistorical idea with that name. It would be possible for us to conceive of any of the before-mentioned Orders as founded at another time. The Jesuit Order, on the other hand, is the genuine double of the Reformation. From the very outset of the Reformation, the Jesuit Order hung upon its heels as closely as a shadow. Nor can we wonder that the Romish Church recognises a special providence in the fact that at the very time when the upas-tree of heresy was planted in Germany, there sprang up in Spain the growth from which the antidote to the poison of heresy was to be prepared. We ourselves regard the appearance of this Order as no fortuitous occurrence, and we therefore propose to devote a full share of our attention to the consideration of its rise.

Nothing can be more unhistorical than the idea that the system which we are about to consider was devised by the crafty brain of one who, though fully convinced of the intrinsic untenability and falsehood of his scheme, yet, like some swindler, extolled his false wares to the world, in order that he might thus impose upon men and deprive them of the blessing of the Reformation. History teaches otherwise. As little as the Reformation of Luther was the issue of a programme hatched by the Wittenberg monk in his cell, to bless or delude the world (according as the movement is viewed with Protestant or Roman Catholic eyes), so little did Ignatius Loyola forecast or foresee the extent of the movement which he initiated in founding his Order. As, however, Luther, though himself unaware of the fact, had in him the germ out of which the Reformation grew, so the personality of Loyola contained the conditions out of which Jesuitism should develop.

Don Inigo Lopez de Recalde was the youngest son of the house of Loyola. He was born in 1491 (eight years subsequent to Luther's birth, and eighteen years before the birth of Calvin), at the castle of Loyola, in the county of Guipuscoa, in Spain. The house of Loyola belonged to the best families

of the kingdom. Ignatius, a son of the chivalrous Beltrande Loyola, was bred in the usages of chivalry at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic, and, like others of his rank, was of a worldly habit of mind, though at the same time susceptible to the religious impressions of the age. At the defence of Pampeluna against the French, in 1521, he was severely wounded in the foot. During the painful confinement consequent upon this injury, he read, in addition to the knightly romances that captivated his fancy, histories of the saints. The deeds of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Dominic made a deep impression on his mind, and he resolved to follow in the footsteps of these heroes of the faith. Accordingly, he tore himself away from his paternal home and from his relatives, repaired to the isolated monastery of Manresa (Montserrat), hung up his weapons before the image of the Queen of Heaven, exchanged his warlike accoutrements for the rough garb of a hermit, imposed upon himself the most rigorous mortifications, and held converse with the unseen world in a condition of ecstasy.

It has been remarked by Ranke[1] that the penitential conflicts to which Ignatius surrendered himself in the monastery of Montserrat are suggestive of similar struggles undergone by Luther a few years previously at Erfurt. But how speedily the ways of these two men diverged! Luther was led to the fountain of truth in the Holy Scriptures, and found consolation in faith in the mercy of God in Christ. Loyola hung, with all the ardour of his imagination, on Mary, the dispenser of mercy; and when Christ drew near to him, it was not in the written word, but in the mysterious host of the altar sacrament. The worship of Mary and adoration of the most venerable Body of Christ are the two poles of his piety, and religious exercises are the expression thereof. The conflicts of the Augustinian at Erfurt led to his separation from the old Church; those of the knightly monk prepared him to be the willing tool of that Church.[2]

[1] *Geschichte der Päpste*, i. p. 183.

[2] A noteworthy parallel between Luther and Loyola was drawn in the seven-

Loyola had, however, to endure many tests of obedience and humility before he ripened into the founder of an Order. He had resolved to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. This intention he accomplished in the year 1523; but failed to meet with the reception for which he had hoped. The Provincial of the Franciscan Order in the Holy Land ordered him to return home and there to study diligently before going, as his purpose was, as a missionary to the Mohammedans, whom he wished to convert. Ignatius returned to Spain. At the age of thirty-three he took his place among the boys at the school of Barcelona, and subjected himself to the discipline of the school. But the study of dry grammar possessed few attractions for him. Nor did he manifest much liking for the elegant language of Erasmus. He became absorbed (and here is another particular in which he resembles Luther) in the writings of the Mystics and Ascetics. Thomas-à-Kempis, above all, furnished his soul with the nourishment which it desired. After pursuing his studies in Alcala de Henarez (the ancient Complutum) and at Salamanca, he repaired to Paris [1528]. In Spain he had been suspected of belonging to the dangerous society of the Illuminati (Alumbeados). At Paris he entered Montaigu College, the same (as we have already seen) that Calvin had attended. It was also in Paris that, in 1534, Loyola, after receiving the degree of Master of Arts, united with his two room-mates in the College of St. Barbara—Peter le Fêvre of Savoy, and Francis Xavier, a young nobleman of Navarre—in forming a religious society, which was joined by two other young Spaniards—James Lainez of Almanzan, and Alphonso Salmeron of Toledo. The society soon received the further accession of two other members —Nicholas Bobadilla, a Spaniard, and a Portuguese named Rodriguez. These seven men assembled in the church of Montmartre on the 15th of August 1534, and took a vow to

tenth century by the Jesuit James Domianus in his *Synopsis historiæ Societatis Jesu primo sæculo, Tomaci* (Tournay), 1640. See GELZER'S *Monatsblätter*, Dec. 1859, pp. 1 sqq.

renounce the world, and to perform a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. After the society had been further strengthened by the addition of a few other members (some Frenchmen had united with it), and they had together been ordained priests at Venice in 1537,[1] they made application to the Papal See for the confirmation of their association. Paul III. complied with their desire in 1540 in the Bull *Regimini militantis.* The intent of the new Order was declared to be the preservation and dissemination of the Christian faith. In addition to the ordinary monastic vows of poverty and chastity, the members of the Order were obliged to promise unconditional obedience to the Roman See. They must engage to perform whatever the pontiff should command them, to proceed without objection or delay to whatever land he should ordain—to Turks, heathen, or heretics. When the question arose as to what name the new Order should bear, Ignatius being unwilling that it should be called after him, its members assumed the name of the Founder of Christianity, and called themselves the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). Instead of *Jesuiten* [Jesuits], the Protestants humorously termed them *Jesuwider* [against Jesus].

The influence of the new society in ecclesiastical matters was immediately perceptible. As soon as the young men had received priestly ordination at Venice in 1537, they made their debut as popular preachers in the territory of the republic, and met with much favour. They preached, as Farel and other Protestants were accustomed to do, in the streets and market-places, using a curious mixture of Italian and Spanish, which heightened the charm of their discourse. They gained access to houses and hospitals. They also endeavoured to acquire an influence over youth, and particularly over students. At Rome, Ignatius distributed his adherents in the various churches. He had been instructed in a vision that Christ would be specially gracious to himself and his followers in Rome (*Romæ vobis propitius ero*). From

[1] ["Ignatius, however, deferred his own ordination until Christmas Day 1538" (APPLETON'S *New Anc. Cycl.*, title "Loyola").—TR.]

the last-mentioned city some of the disciples of Loyola proceeded to Brixen, in the Tyrol, to Parma, Piacenza, and Calabria. The Jesuits gained a foothold in Germany likewise, especially in Austria and Bavaria. The city of Ingolstadt in Bavaria was assigned them by Duke William IV. in 1556. At about the same time Cologne threw open its gates to them. On the other hand, the Parliament of France was at first opposed to their reception, but they succeeded, nevertheless, in gaining access to that kingdom. Lyons was the seat of their first settlement. But Europe did not satisfy the missionary zeal of the Order. The thoughts of its founder, from the outset of his monastic career, had travelled across the waters. In the year 1540, at the desire of John III., king of Portugal, two members of the Order, Rodriguez and Xavier, repaired to the East Indies, and soon afterwards (in 1542) a Jesuit college was established at Goa, the capital of the Portuguese possessions. A new favour was conferred upon the Order in 1543 by an enactment of Paul III., providing that the society might receive as many members as it would, though at first the number was limited to sixty. Two years subsequently the Jesuits received permission to preach in all churches and on public squares, to hear confessions, to absolve persons of every rank, and even to pardon those sins whose forgiveness had previously pertained to the Apostolic See exclusively. In 1549 their possessions were declared exempt from tithes, and still further privileges were accorded them. Ignatius died on the 31st of July 1556. Soon after the establishment of the Order which he founded, he was elected general thereof. He accepted this position from motives of obedience only, and as an exercise of humility went immediately into the kitchen of the monastery, there to serve as scullion. At the time of his death, the Order could already boast of one thousand members and one hundred colleges.[1] Of the thirteen provinces into

[1] Of course Ignatius was elevated to the rank of saint after his death. His canonization took place under Gregory XV. (13th March 1623) and Urban VIII. (6th August of the same year). His festival falls on the 31st of July. No one,

which it was divided, seven were to be found on the Pyrenean Peninsula, three in Italy, one in France, and two in Germany.

With the exception of the two great mendicant Orders of the Middle Ages, no religious Order has ever existed whose importance has in degree approached that of the Order of the Jesuits. It has far surpassed even its prototypes instituted by St. Dominic and St. Francis. The spirit of the Order, its institutions, its principles, its efforts, and the results accomplished by it, we shall become acquainted with at some future time. For the present, this notice of its founding will suffice.

To complete the picture of the Catholic Church during the age of the Reformation, we shall introduce here two portraits, which will show that in the midst of this season of defection from Rome and its legal religion, the old stern penitential system still possessed some original representatives, deeply imbued with mediæval Mysticism.

One such original ascetic was the Florentine, Philip of Neri, whom Göthe called "a humorous saint," and to whom he has paid a genial tribute in his writings.[1] Philip was born on the 22d of July 1515, and was the scion of a good family. He was distinguished even as a boy for his rare piety. He studied at Rome in the year 1533, but soon abandoned his studies because they did not lead him to that salvation for which he longed. He sold his school-books that he might know nothing but Christ. He believed that he had a sensuous perception of the streams of grace which poured down upon him from above while he lay prostrate in prayer before God. Frequently he would cry out: "Enough, Lord! Restrain the torrents of Thy grace." On some occasions he felt constrained to give vent to his inward ardour by rending his garments. In prostrating himself before the altar, he broke two of his ribs, which injury occasioned him palpitation of the heart during the remainder of his life. He declared,

it was declared, had deprived the devil of so many souls as he, insomuch that his success in this particular had occasioned an uproar in hell.

[1] See GÖTHE'S *Werke* (12mo edition), xxxviii. p. 249, and xxxix. p. 190.

however, that he had been wounded by divine love. On the 23d of May 1551, he was ordained to the priesthood. In company with some congenial spirits, he instituted a series of meetings for devotional exercises. At these prayer meetings (oratories) religious songs were sung, and hence the musical term "oratorio," as applied to dramatized religious music.[1] The nature of Philip was thoroughly practical. All dogmatical or speculative discourses, all discussions of subtle questions, were excluded from his devotional assemblies. His worship of God consisted in the care of the poor and the sick. Twice a week Neri, with his companions, visited the neglected hospitals. He introduced a cheerful piety into the dismal chambers of the sick. He recommended the avoidance of melancholy and of a downcast demeanour, and required that every duty should be performed cheerfully. "Be cheerful, or all thou doest is nought," was his chosen motto. Another saying, which he borrowed from St. Bernard, was: "To despise the world, to despise no one, to despise oneself, and to despise being despised."[2] With the greatest good humour he took upon himself the performance of the meanest offices, and cared nothing when people called him a fool; on the contrary, by his singular appearance he tempted the world to deride him. He had friends among the Jesuits. Although contemporary with the Reformation, he survived it by a number of years, dying in 1595 at the age of eighty.

A less genial, if not exactly a gloomy character was that of the Spaniard, Peter of Alcantara. He was born in 1499 in Estremadura, and sprang, like Loyola, of a noble race. Even as a child he exhibited great fondness for prayer. He would possess himself of the key of the house chapel, and secretly resort thither to perform his devotions. When he came from

[1] ["Its origin" (that of the *oratorio*) "has generally been ascribed to St. Philip Neri, who in 1540 founded the congregation of the Oratory in Rome (whence the term oratorio), one of the objects of which was to deter young people from profane amusements by rendering religious services as attractive as possible" (APPLETON'S *New Anc. Cycl.*, title "Oratorio").—TR.]

[2] *Spernere mundum, spernere neminem, spernere seipsum, spernere se sperni.*

school, he was wont to hasten to the nearest church, where he frequently remained for hours on his knees before the crucifix or the host, absorbed in the most profound devotion. He continued this manner of life as a student at Salamanca, whither he repaired after he had completed his fourteenth year. At Alcantara he entered the Franciscan Order of John of Guadaloupe (who died in 1506). In the monastery of San Francesco de Monseretes, he soon exceeded all the other monks in the rigour of his asceticism. So absorbed would he become in his religious exercises, that he would not be aware of what was passing around him. On his transfer to another cloister in North Estremadura, he afflicted himself still more severely, if possible. When disciplining himself in the night watches to the melancholy accompaniment of the *Miserere* or the *De profundis*, he wielded the scourge so manfully and sang in so mournful and penetrating a tone as to arouse the neighbourhood from sleep. In one of his fits of ecstasy (so it was believed), he was lifted several feet above the earth, and hovered, with outstretched arms, suspended in the air, as persons occasionally dream of doing. When but twenty years old, he was the spiritual director of more than one Spanish count, and in 1519 he received from the Provincial of the Franciscan Observant-province of Estremadura permission to found a new monastery of Observants at Badajoz. For this purpose it was necessary to erect a building, and Peter himself assisted in the mason work. He gave evidence of his humility by washing the feet of the monks. When about to receive priestly ordination, he prepared himself for the rite by further mortifications of the flesh, after first expressing his reluctance to become a recipient of the ordinance. He wept as he read mass for the first time. His first sermon (on Prayer) was a powerful and thrilling discourse. He was appointed guardian of the monastery of Our Lady de Los Angelos, which was situated in a valley near Babredillo, on the northern boundary of Estremadura. A few days before Christmas, a heavy fall of snow separated this monastery from

the rest of the world, and the stock of provisions became exhausted; at this juncture, while the holy Peter was praying in his cell, the bell of the cloister was heard to ring, and when the monks had shovelled their way to the gate, they found baskets containing food awaiting them. After a short time, Peter was created guardian of his Order at Badajoz. There he composed a treatise *On Prayer*, which is his only production of any considerable note that remains to us. He next visited Portugal, in compliance with the invitation of King John III. He won the Infanta Donna Maria for the Order of St. Francis, and converted many of the courtiers—among others the Duke of Braganza, the Duke of Aveiro, and the Marquis of Nizza. When invited to court, he played the fool, having sewed particoloured rags on his habit; his conduct was, however, regarded as the originality of a saint, in whom the greatest oddities are excusable. He established a hermitage in the Sierra di Arabida, a few miles south of the spot where the Tagus discharges its waters into the ocean. From 1538 to 1542 he was Provincial of his Order. He travelled barefooted through the provinces for the purpose of reforming the cloisters. Everywhere he set the example of humility. After his term of service had expired, he withdrew once more to his hermitage, accompanied by his pupil, Michael de Catena. But the Lutheran heresy, which was diffusing itself in his neighbourhood, summoned him to the conflict. In company with his associate, he repaired to Rome in 1554, during the pontificate of Julius III., and endeavoured to bring about a reform in his Order. Returning to Spain, he erected at Placentia a model monastery after his own mind. This cloister was intended to resemble a grave. It was 32 feet long and 28 feet wide, and was designed to accommodate twelve monks. The cells and doors were narrow. No images were tolerated in the chapel, as they were declared to be rather a hindrance than a help to devotion. In this puritanical strictness, Peter of Alcantara resembled Calvin. Other monasteries were built after the same plan. Peter

subsequently travelled much about the country, and encountered some opposition from unreformed brethren of his Order, all of which, however, he endured with patience. Miracles are said to have been performed by him. He died 18th October 1562, in a monastery of his Order at Arenas. A pleasant odour diffused itself through his death-chamber, and the melody of angelic choirs was heard in the air. He was afterwards enrolled in the canon of saints.[1]

As a companion piece to the portrait of this rigorous man, we have now to sketch the character of a woman, St. Theresa of Jesus. In her, as in Loyola, Catholic historiography beholds an antidote to the Lutheran heresy. Instead of the thorn, it is declared, came up the fir tree, and instead of the brier came up the myrtle tree (Isa. lv. 13). Theresa was born at Avila in Old Castile, on the 25th of March 1515. Her parents belonged to the nobility, and were very pious, after the fashion of their fathers. Little Theresa early took delight in the legends and devotional exercises of the Church. She prepared herself a little hermitage in her garden, was kind to the poor, and prayed diligently. When her mother died, she cast herself weeping before the image of the mother of God, who was thenceforth to be *her* mother also. After the marriage of her only sister, her father placed her in a nunnery where the daughters of families of rank received their education. There Theresa's liking for a convent life matured, being strengthened especially by the writings of St. Jerome. Without the knowledge of her father, she one day entered the Society of Carmelite Nuns as a novice, and took the vows of that Order in November 1534. She had just recovered from a severe illness when her father died. Among the men who, together with the *Confessions of St. Augustine*, exercised the most powerful influence over her mind, was Peter of Alcantara. As the latter aimed at reforming the Franciscan Order, so Theresa bent her thoughts upon improv-

[1] He was canonized by Gregory XV., 1622, and by Clement X., 1669. Comp. ZÖCKLER in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1864, i.

ing the Order of Carmelitesses—*i.e.*, upon increasing the severity of its rules. She became the foundress of a branch Order of these nuns, that of the "Unshod Carmelitesses," for whom, after much difficulty, she had a special convent built, which was called the Convent of St. Joseph (1562). Theresa died at the age of sixty-seven, on the 5th (15th) of October 1582. Her eyes, as she lay dying, were constantly fixed upon the crucifix which she held in her hands. The Duchess of Alba, who, shortly before the death of this holy woman, had summoned her to her yicinity, erected a splendid monument to her memory. Theresa also distinguished herself as an authoress. In her forty-eighth year she penned, by the advice of her confessor, a history of the development of her inner life, in which narrative, as clearly as in a mirror, her God-centred character may be seen.[1]

We have no more time at present to devote to these saintly personages, but shall recur to these and kindred characters in our history of the anti-Reformation in the second half of the sixteenth century. It has been our purpose to demonstrate, by the facts which we have already communicated, the striving of an earnest, heart-felt piety, and a deep though one-sided understanding of religious things to assert their existence, even in connection with the transmitted system of belief and its ecclesiastical forms.

But, finally, it is a fact which we must not pass over in silence, that the Romish Church opposed the innovations which she disapproved not only by a species of religious rivalry, but also, in accordance with her time-honoured practice, with the weapons of violence. We have already cited sufficient instances of her severity, and shall become acquainted with still more horrible deeds performed under her sanction when we arrive at the history of the anti-Reform movement. In the meantime, let us revert for a moment to the institution

[1] HAMBERGER, *Stimmen aus dem Heiligthum der christlichen mystik und Theosophie*, Stuttgart, 1857, vol. i. pp. 189 sqq.; ZOCKLER, in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1865, ii. [APPLETON'S *Cycl.*].

of the Inquisition, of which we have already treated in our *History of the Church in the Middle Ages.*[1] Caraffa and Burgos, in consideration of the Reformation, persuaded Pope Paul III. to establish a supreme tribunal of Inquisition at Rome, to which all other spiritual courts should be subordinate. As St. Peter quelled the first heresiarch, Simon Magus, at Rome,[2] so it was claimed the successor of Peter must from Rome subdue all heretics. On the 21st of July 1542, the pontiff issued a bull proclaiming six cardinals, Caraffa and Toledo among the number, commissioners of the Apostolic See, and general inquisitors on both sides of the Alps. These dignitaries were authorized to invest other ecclesiastics with similar power in such places as they deemed expedient. All matters without distinction were declared subject to their jurisdiction. They were unconditionally privileged to inflict capital punishment; they could not pardon, for the pope reserved that right to himself. By order of Cardinal Caraffa, a house was immediately fitted up at Rome for the purposes of the Inquisition, and furnished with secure dungeons, with appropriate locks and bolts. The efforts of the holy office of the Inquisition (*il sacro ufizio dell' inquisitione*) were directed not only against those who were suspected of Protestantism, but against all who betrayed a leaning toward innovations of any sort. The result was that a number of academies were closed, and books were subjected to a rigorous censorship (an *Index librorum prohibitorum* was prepared). Hence we can readily understand how books like the treatise *Concerning the Benefit of Christ* were destroyed, with the exception of a few copies.

In conclusion, let us glance at the Greek Church.

The Greek Church was in its development behind the Romish Church. In the earlier centuries it had indeed departed in many respects from the apostolic foundation, but it had also avoided various abuses of the Romish Church. It recognised neither the celibacy of priests (of the lower orders,

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 340 and 632 [German]. [2] See *Kirchengesch.* i. p. 60.

at all events), nor the exclusion of the laity from the cup in the Lord's Supper, nor the doctrine of purgatory. In regard also to ceremonies and the worship of images, it had at least observed some moderation, and it was also more moderate than the Romish Church in the reverence which it paid to saints. The mere fact that the Greeks were regarded as schismatics by the Romish Church, tended to bring them, like the Hussites and Waldenses, near to the Protestants. In addition to this, their language was that of the New Testament and of the Greek fathers of the Church, for whom the Reformers manifested so strong a predilection. The culture of this tongue, neglected by the Romanists, must necessarily awaken Humanistic sympathies. True, the doctrinal system of the Greek Church inclined to Pelagianism. Its views of sin and grace were pre-Augustinian, while the dogmas of the Reformation were deeply imbued with the tenets of Augustine. But might not an agreement be arrived at concerning these differences? We can well understand the desire of the adherents of the Reformation to seek an alliance with the Greek Church. There were young Greeks studying at Wittenberg as well as elsewhere in Germany, and through one such student, the Greek deacon Demetrius Mysus, Melanchthon in 1559 sent a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession to Joasaph II., patriarch of Constantinople. The catechisms of Luther were likewise translated into Greek. The requisite conditions for an actual agreement were, however, lacking. On a subsequent occasion, further negotiations were set on foot between the Reformed and Greek Churches, but were in their turn broken off. We shall return to a consideration of these topics at some future time. For the present we must take leave of the age of the Reformation, with its many agitations and conflicts; with its mysteries, which have never yet been fully and completely fathomed, but are continually tempting to fresh investigations and revealing new outlooks.

THE END.

INDEX.

ADRIAN VI., his reformatory views, i. 189; his letter to the Diet of Nuremberg: its unfavourable reception, 190; his death, 191.

Aebli, Landamman of Glarus, mediates between Zurich and the Romanist Cantons, ii. 92.

Agricola, Reformer at Augsburg, at Marburg Conference, ii. 104; at Diet of Augsburg, 110; employed by Charles v. to draw up Augsburg Interim, 278.

Alba, Duke of, commands for Charles v. in the Schmalkaldic War, ii. 269; wins battle of Mühlberg, 270; his share in Philip of Hesse's captivity, 274; advises Charles to exhume Luther's body, 275; his inquisitorial supervision of Philip of Hesse's imprisonment, 291.

Alba, Duchess of, her admiration of St. Theresa, ii. 414.

Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, engaged in sale of indulgences, i. 94; appealed to by Luther, 99; corresponds with him, 167, 168; joins Holy Alliance, ii. 234; tolerates Protestantism, 237; his reception of Augsburg Interim, 279; afterwards opposes it, 282.

Albert of Brandenburg favours the Reformation, i. 217; supports Maurice of Saxony, ii. 294; quarrels with him, 297.

Albert of Prussia embraces the Reformation and secularizes his dominions, ii. 9; favours the Reformer Lismann, 357.

Alexander at Diet of Worms as Papal Legate, i. 135; excommunicates Luther, 139; protests against Peace of Nuremberg, ii. 162.

Ameaux, his hostility to Calvin, and its causes, ii. 331.

Amerbach, his friendship with Erasmus, ii. 80; professor at Basel, 82.

Am-Grüt, town-clerk of Zurich, his Eucharistic controversy with Zwingle, i. 311.

Amsdorf accompanies Luther to Worms, i. 132; separated from him, 138; accommodates Luther on his visit to Wittenberg, 169; preaches at Magdeburg, 219; his connection with Katharine von Bora, 401; his character, 421; his labours at Leipsic, ii. 237; made Bishop of Naumburg, 245; publishes the Papal bull, 268.

Anabaptists, review of their tenets, ii. 26-28; their excesses, 29-32; disputes with them at Zurich, 33, 34; their sufferings, 34, 35; severity of their treatment in Switzerland, 39; condemned in Augsburg Confession, 119, 120; and by Basel Confession, 185; their excesses at Münster, 217.

Anderson, Chancellor of Sweden, favours the Reformation, i. 220, 221.

Anhalt, Wolfgang, Prince of, signs Speier Protest, ii. 21; and Augsburg Confession, 117; at Diet of Schmalkalden, 156.

Anna, St., imposture of, at Bern, i. 262.

Anshelm, persecution of himself and his wife, i. 327, 328.

Apocalypse rejected by Luther, i. 159.

Arcimboldi, his industry in sale of indulgences, i. 94; opposed by Elia, 221.

Augsburg, Diet of, a critical epoch, i. 24, ii. 132; importance of the city, i. 31; Luther summoned thither, 105; Diet convoked, ii. 109; Protestant Confession of, 118, 119; Recess of the Diet, 130, 131; the Reformation there, 210; "Armed Diet" of, 277; Interim drawn up there, 279; Fourth Diet of, small attendance at it, 288; another Diet there, 298; Religious Peace concluded there, 299, 300; its results, 300.

Augustinian monks, their reformatory tendencies, i. 171, 195.

Augustus, Duke of Saxony, succeeds his brother Maurice, and concludes Treaty of Naumburg, ii. 298.
Austria, its rivalry with France, i. 26; its influence on Swiss politics, ii. 73.

BADEN, disputation at, ii. 41, 42; its results, 48; state of the Reformation there, 210.
Barletta, specimen of his preaching, i. 40.
Barnim of Pomerania, rector of Wittenberg, at Leipsic Disputation, i. 116; his interest in it, 119; his Reformation tendencies, ii. 211; joins Schmalkaldic League, 224.
Basel, sketch of the city, i. 266, 267; influence of its University on the Reformation, 268; disputation there, 331–333; insurrection there, 395–398; further disturbances there, ii. 53; final victory of the Reformation, 66–79; changes in the University, 81; constitutional and moral reforms, 84.
Basel, Little, its hostility to the Reformation, ii. 71, 77, 79.
Bassi founds the Order of the Capuchins, ii. 399, 400.
Baudichon attacked by Genevan mob, ii. 200; protects Froment, 201; flees to Bern, sent back from Bern to Geneva, 202.
Beccaria preaches Reformed doctrines in Locarno, consequently banished thence, ii. 360.
Beer presides at Baden Disputation, ii. 44, 45; flees from Basel, 74, 79.
Bern, progress of Reformation there, i. 263–265, and 326–329; its neutrality, 310; reaction there after Baden Disputation, ii. 48, 49; Disputation there, 54–58; its results favourable to the Reformation, 58; unwillingness of the city to war, 91; joy there at Peace of Steinhausen, 94; forces Reformation on Aigle, 187; protects Farel, 192, 193; etc.; interferes in Genevan Reformation, 201; Eucharistic Synod there, 351.
Berquin, French Protestant, his martyrdom, ii. 154.
Berthelier, leader of Genevan Libertines, ii. 341; obliged to leave Geneva, 342.
Beza, his persecuting tendencies, i. 175; his conduct to Bolsec, ii. 333; his account of Servetus, 335; his defence of punishment of heretics, 339; rector of Geneva Academy, 342; gives Calvin while dying the Lord's Supper, 343; his account of Calvin's death, 344; and of his personal appearance, 345.
Bible, poverty of mediæval study of, i. 10, 296; Luther's translation of, 143–150.
Bibliander, professor at Basel, ii. 181; at Eucharistic Conference of Aarau, 229.
Blansch, Reformer at Tubingen, at Zurich Conference, i. 295.
Blarer, Ambrose, Swabian Reformer, i. 200; at Bern Disputation, ii. 55; his early life, 60; at Constance, 61; at Thurgau, 64; engaged in Wurtemberg Reformation, 208, 209; agrees to compromise Eucharistic controversy, 209.
Blarer, Margaret, leading deaconess at Constance, ii. 379.
Blaurock, Swiss Anabaptist, ii. 24; his persecution and death, 35.
Bodenstein. *See* Karlstadt.
Bohemia, followers of Huss in, i. 42; their tenets partly supported by Luther, 119.
Bolsec disputes Calvin's doctrine of election, ii. 333; he is banished: his libellous tractate on Calvin, 334; revival of his adherents after Servetus' execution, 339.
Boniface VIII. founds system of indulgences, i. 93.
Bonivard, Reformer at Geneva, ii. 195; his reforms rather social than moral: his capricious character, 196.
Bora, Katharine von, escapes from Minptschen nunnery: Luther's care for her welfare, i. 400; he marries her, 401; her married life, 401, 402; comforts her husband in a severe sickness, 405; her anxiety in his absence, ii. 254; privations of her later life: her death, 257.
Botanus visits Basel churches for Œcolampadius, ii. 68; his death in battle, 167; succeeded by Oswald Myconius, 184.
Bourbon, the Constable, his sack of Rome, ii. 15.
Boyheim, his attitude to the Reformation at Constance, ii. 63.
Brandenburg, George, Margrave of, ii. 9; signs Protest of Speier, 21; at Diet of Augsburg, 114; signs Melanchthon's Confession, 116.
Brandenburg, House of, its attitude to the Reformation, ii. 8, 9.
Brenz, chief Swabian Reformer, i. 198; his Lutheran views of the Eucharist, 369; his *Syngramma*: its vagueness, 369, 370; his views on the Pea-

sant War, 385 ; at Marburg, ii. 104; at Diet of Augsburg, 124 ; recommended to Ulrich of Wurtemberg, 208 ; assists Schnepf at Stuttgart, 210 ; at Worms Conference, 241 ; rejects Augsburg Interim, 280 ; his persecution and flight to Basel, 281 ; reproaches Melanchthon with cowardice, 284; opposes Schwenkfeldt, 387.

Brethren of the Common Life, i. 18, 19, note; their educational influence, 74.

Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, protects Faber, i. 226, 227.

Briefer presides at Disputation of Bern : his caution, ii. 57.

Brismann, Reformer in Lusatia and Königsberg, i. 216.

Brödtlein, Swiss Anabaptist, ii. 24, 25.

Bucer dissuades Luther from going to Worms, i. 133; joins Zell at Strassburg, 201 ; marries Œcolampadius' widow, 403 ; at Bern Disputation, ii. 55 ; goes to Marburg, 103 ; visits Luther at Coburg, 111 ; draws up *Tetrapolitana*, 125; gains its supporters admission to the Schmalkaldic League, 159; friend of Farel, 186 ; his early life, 225 ; attempts to compromise Eucharistic controversy, 226 ; attends conferences on the subject, 229; at Worms Conference, 241 ; induces Calvin to come to Strassburg, 318 ; and to return to Geneva, 321 ; goes to England, 363.

Bugenhagen, at Hamburg, i. 211 ; sketch of his life, 213 ; teaches at Wittenberg, 214; his views on the Eucharist, 370 ; present at Luther's marriage, 401 ; his family life, 421 ; at Marburg, ii. 104 ; advises John Frederick against a Council, 206 ; visits Pomerania, 211 ; assists in Brunswick Reformation, 248 ; preaches Luther's funeral sermon, 256 ; his conduct in siege of Wittenberg, 271 ; acknowledges the rule of Maurice, 275 ; assists to prepare Leipsic Interim, 283.

Bullinger opposes Samson's traffic in Switzerland, i. 253 ; his marriage, ii. 176, note; embraces the Reformation, 179 ; flees to Zurich, 180.

Bullinger, son of the above, his account of Bern Disputation, ii. 55; succeeds Zwingle at Zurich, 176 ; his early life, 177 ; friend of Zwingle, 178; his views on the Eucharist, 179 ; his work at Bremgarten and flight to Zurich, 180 ; made rector of Zurich Cathedral, 181; summoned before the Council, 183 ; at Basel Conference, 229 ; congratulates Philip of Hesse on his release, 296 ; his views on Servetus' case, 337 ; his grief on Calvin's death, 344 ; his agreement with Calvin on the Eucharist, 351 ; receives Calvin and Farel at Zurich, 352 ; his interest in the Locarnese Reformation, 350 ; and hospitable reception of its exiles, 361 ; opposes Schwenkfeldt, 387 ; his connection with Thamer, 391.

Busch, Hermann, a Humanist, i. 55 ; teaches Bugenhagen, 213.

Cajetan, his character : sent to Augsburg : his wrath against Luther, i. 105.

Calvin, centre of Latin Reformation, 226 ; his views on the Eucharist, 375 ; his Old Testament spirit, ii. 139 ; meets Melanchthon at Worms Conference, 241 ; displeased with Melanchthon's temporizing, 284 ; his position in the Reformation, 301 ; his family, 302 ; his early life and education, 303 ; his legal studies, 304 ; embraces Evangelical doctrines and flees to Navarre, 304, 305 ; his retired life : he writes his *Institutes*, 306 ; review of the *Institutes*, 307 ; his doctrines of Election, 309 ; of the Church, 310; of the Sacraments, 311; unique character of this work, 311 ; his sojourn in Italy, return to France, and arrival at Geneva, 312 ; his work there with Farel, 313 ; severity of his regulations : at Lausanne Disputation, 314 ; his dispute with Caroli, 315 ; and with the Genevan Government, 316 ; refuses to celebrate the communion and is banished, 317 ; goes to Strassburg : his connection with the German Reformers, 318 ; his marriage and family : his cosmopolitan character, 319 ; his writings at Strassburg : his answer to Cardinal Sadolet, 320 ; hesitates to return to Geneva, 321 ; his return, 322 ; his position there, 323 ; his theocratic ideas, 324 ; his ecclesiastical discipline and Catechism, 325 ; tends to persecution, 327 ; his controversy with Castellio, 328 ; his speech on Castellio's exile, 329; his conflict with the Libertines, 330 ; difficulties of his position : his dispute with Ameaux, 331 ; his life threatened by Perrin and Gruet, 332 ; his controversy with Bolsec, 333, 334 ; his early connection with

Servetus: procures his arrest, 335; his conduct in this case, 336, 337; presses for his death, 337; vindicates his conduct, 339; his conduct blameworthy, but much exaggerated, 340; refuses to admit Berthelier to communion, 341; his share in founding the Geneva Academy: his bodily debility, 342; his last days, 343; his death and burial, 344; his personal appearance: comparison of him with Luther and Zwingle, 345; œcumenical character of his work, 346; his unattractiveness, 347; his conduct in controversy, 347, 348; strength of his sympathies, 348, 349; his want of poetry and humour, 349; his excellencies and Luther's complementary, 350; universality of his Reformation, 350, 351; at Eucharistic Synod of Bern, 351; visits Bullinger at Zurich with Farel: approves Zurich Consensus, 352; his interest in the Locarnese Church, 360; tries to improve the cloth manufacture, 380; his views of amusement more strict than Luther's, 381.

Camerarius, biographer of Melanchthon, i. 72, 112, note; preaches Reformed doctrines, 170; his last interview with Melanchthon, ii. 353.

Camerino, Duchess of, favours the Capuchins, ii. 400.

Campeggi, legate of Clement VII. to Diet of Nuremberg, i. 191; unites Roman Catholic states at Ratisbon, 192; at Conference of Worms, ii. 241.

Campeggio, Papal legate at Diet of Augsburg, ii. 114; tries to silence Mollio, 358.

Capito remonstrates with Luther for his boldness, i. 168; joins Zell at Strassburg, 201; receives French refugees there, 227; adopts Zwingle's style of preaching, 241; his work at Basel, 269; friend of Œcolampadius, 276; marries his widow, 403; at Bern Disputation, ii. 57; disapproves Luther's violence, 97; friend of Farel, 186; at Aarau Conference, 230; and at Worms Conference, 241.

Capuchins, Order of, their foundation, ii. 399; their constitution and character, 400; their affiliated Order of nuns, 401.

Caraffa, Cardinal, his early connection with the Theatines, ii. 402; induces Paul III. to reorganize the Inquisition, 415.

Caroli, at Lausanne Disputation, Reformed pastor there, ii. 314; his dispute with Calvin and return to Romanism, 315.

Castellio, sketch of his life, ii. 327; his Humanist tendencies and doctrinal dispute with Calvin, 328; leaves Geneva, 329; probable author of the *Martin Bellius* anti-Calvin pamphlet, 339.

Catholic Apostolic opposed to Evangelical Church, i. 1; its struggles with the Empire, 8, 9; with France, 10; easily condones moral offences, 18; disintegration of, 35; popular contempt for its ordinances, 36–39; retains germs of truth, 43; necessity for its internal reform, ii. 395.

Cellarius, one of the "Zwickau prophets," i. 173.

Ceporinus assists Zwingle at Zurich, i. 325.

Charlemagne protects the Church, i. 8; advocates preaching in vernacular, 18.

Charles V., Emperor, his accession, i. 26; performance of dumb comedy before him, 77; desires Luther's presence at Worms, 131; at the Diet, 135; disapproves edict of Nuremberg, 191; tries to check Frankfort Reformation, 202; his victory at Pavia and consequent German policy, ii. 2-4; summons Diet of Augsburg, 109; his interviews with John of Saxony before its opening, 112; his entry into Augsburg, 113; silences preaching there, 115; his displeasure with the Protestants, 125; tries to break up Schmalkaldic League, 159; concludes Peace of Nuremberg, 161; desires to summon General Council, 206; joins Holy Alliance, 234; at Diet of Regensburg, 242; revives Peace of Nuremberg, 244; concludes Peace of Crespy, 249; declares war on the League, 267; at Mühlberg and Wittenberg, 270; his moderation there, 275; refuses to acknowledge Trent Council, 276; desires tolerance, 277; disapproves the summons to Council of Trent, 288; refuses to believe in Maurice of Saxony's hostility, 290; is defeated by him, 295; his abdication and death, 300; his opinion of Mollio's preaching, 359.

Charles, Duke of Savoy, tries in vain to make Geneva renounce the Reformation, ii. 204, 205.

Christian II. of Denmark, crowned King of Sweden, i. 220; indecision of his ecclesiastical position, 221.

Christian III. of Denmark joins the Schmalkaldic League, ii. 235.
Christianity, its establishment, extension, and corruption, i. 6, 12; truths of, only defined by conflict, 7.
Clarenbach, his early life, ii. 150; his arrest and martyrdom, 152.
Clement VII., his papal policy, i. 191; his death, ii. 223; appoints an Inquisitor for Spain, 361; authorizes Capuchin Order, 400; and Pauline Order, 401; and Theatine Order, 402.
Clopris, an Augustinian monk, ii. 151; his Lutheran tendencies and consequent arrest, 152.
Cochlæus attacks Luther's translation of the Bible, i. 149; confutes Augsburg Confession, ii. 123; at Hagenau Conference, 240; and at Worms, 241.
Cologne, Chapter of, its part in the Reuchlinian controversy, i. 53.
Comander, Reformer in the Grisons, ii. 39; at Disputation of Ilanz, 40.
Confessions of Augsburg, ii. 118, 119; Tetrapolitan, 125, 126; Zwinglian, 126-129; their importance, 132-136; review of their circumstances, 135; and doctrines, 140-150; Danish Confession of Copenhagen, 155; and of Basel, 184, 185; Second of Basel, or First Helvetic, 230; Schmalkaldic Articles, 234.
Constance, Reformation there, ii. 61; its league with Zurich, 63.
Contarini, Papal nuncio at Regensburg, his attitude there, ii. 242, and note.
Copernicus adheres to Romanism, ii. 375.
Copus, rector of Paris University, becomes unpopular through Calvin's speech for him, ii. 305.
Corderius, tutor of Calvin, ii. 303.
Cordus, Euricius, supports Reuchlin, i. 55; preaches Reformed doctrines, 170; welcomes Reformers to Magdeburg, ii. 104.
Corvinus, Antony, preacher to Philip of Hesse, ii. 221; helps to establish the Reformation in Brunswick, 246.
Courault, Reformed preacher at Geneva, ii. 315; his passionate conduct in the pulpit, 316; is imprisoned and banished, 317; goes as pastor to Orbe, 318.
Cranmer, his work in England, ii. 363; his persecution and martyrdom, 364.
Crescentio, Cardinal, favourite of Pope Julius III., ii. 288; presides in Council of Trent, 399.
Cruciger, Caspar, labours at Leipsic, ii. 237; his connection with Luther's writings, 259.

Devay, leading Hungarian Reformer, ii. 356, 357.
Didymus, lecturer at Buchholz, i. 171; supports Karlstadt's views, 172.
Diets of Augsburg, i. 105; of Worms, 135; of Nuremberg, 190; its issue favourable to the Reformation, 191; compared with that of Worms, 192, 193; of Speier, ii. 4; Second Diet there, 20; Second Diet of Augsburg, 109; of Regensburg, 241; further Diets at Augsburg—*see* Augsburg.
Dominican monks, their dispute with Reuchlin, i. 50-54; anti-Reform tendencies of, 195; their dispute with the Franciscans at Bern, 258; organize imposture of St. Anna there, 262.
Dorfmann, Swiss Reformer in the Grisons, i. 342.
Draco, Reformer at Miltenberg, 209.
Dumb comedy performed before Emperor Charles V., i. 77; its representative character, 78.
Dumoulin accompanies Froment to Geneva, ii. 201; is banished thence: his martyrdom at Lyons, 202.
Dusentschuer, Anabaptist pseudo-prophet at Münster, ii. 219.

Eber preaches Melanchthon's funeral sermon, ii. 354; his poetical talents, 376.
Eberlin, Reformed preacher, friend of Hutten, Sickingen, and Melanchthon, i. 196; his "Fifteen Allies," 230.
Eck joins in Indulgence controversy, i. 102; his previous history, 103, note; publicly disputes with Luther and Melanchthon at Leipsic, 116 et seq.; described by Mosellanus, 121, 122; procures a bull condemning Luther, 127; opposes Reformation in Bavaria, 206; his treatment of the Baroness von Grumbach, 207; satirized in popular ballads, 229; challenges Zwingle to a disputation, ii. 41; his thesis at Baden Disputation, 42; his conduct there, 45; confutes Augsburg Confession, 123; attacks Zwingle, 130; at Conference of Hagenau, 240; and of Worms, 241.
Edward VI. of England, his reign favourable to the Reformation, ii. 363; his death, 364.
Egidius, early Spanish Protestant, his imprisonment, ii. 361, 362.

Elia, Danish Reformer, opposes Arcimboldi's sale of indulgences, i. 221.
Emden, progress of Reformation at, i. 211.
Emser, his writings burned by Luther, i. 129; attacks Luther's translation of the Bible, 149; abusively attacked by Luther, 169, note.
England, Reformation in, i. 27; its doctrinal peculiarities, ii. 362, 363; opposed by Queen Mary, 364.
Ennius, Papal legate at Zurich, ii. 182; stirs up the Catholic cantons against Zurich, 183.
Ensiedeln, its legend, i. 237.
Erasmus, elegance of his Latin, i. 33; his superstition, 40, note; parallel between him and Hutten, 61; his early life, 62; his residence in the monastery and its results, 63; his reputation, 64; his personal appearance, 64, 65; his want of principle, 66; and of enthusiasm, 67; his beneficial influence on the Reformation: his *Praise of Folly*, 68; his residence at Basel and delight in its society, 69, 70; his desire for popular education, 70, 71; his popularity, 72; praises Wimpheling, 76; contrasted with Luther, 84, 87, 278, 289; differs from Luther on justification, 91; his favourable opinion of Melanchthon, 114; Kessler's account of him at Basel, 181; friend of Zwingle, 235, 289, 356; his attitude to Basel Reformation, 268; and relations with Luther, 281, 282, 284; contrasted with Hutten, 285; his treatment of him, 287; differs from Luther on free-will, 289; his hesitation in theology, 290; his position in the Eucharistic controversy, 368; opposes the Reformers' marriages, 402; refuses to be present at Baden Disputation, ii. 44; his ideas of a compromise, 50; leaves Basel, 79; dies, 80.
Eric, Duke of Brunswick, his attention to Luther, i. 137.
Ernest, Duke of Lüneburg, signs Speier Protest, ii. 21; and Augsburg Confession, 116; corresponds with Luther, 227.
Esch, his martyrdom, i. 223, 224.
Esslingen, energy of the Reformation there, i. 196, 199; letter sent thither by Luther, 199; Reformed doctrine rendered compulsory there, 200.
Eucharistic controversy at Zurich, i. 301 303, 311, 312; its rise, 350–353; its points of agreement and controversy between Lutherans and Zwinglians, 358, 359; originates with Luther and Karlstadt, 361; respective positions assumed in it by Luther, 359, 369; Zwingle, 364, 365; Œcolampadius, 365-367; the Council of Basel, 362, 367; and Erasmus, 368; its unedifying nature, 373; its importance, 373–378; its final settlement neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian, 376, 377; projected disputation on, ii. 22; progress of, between Luther and Zwingle, 96–103; disputation on, takes place at Marburg, 103—*see* Marburg; Lambert's views on, 107, 108; its place in the Augsburg Confession, 117; and in the Tetrapolitana, 126; only point of divergence between Luther and Zwingle, 140; Zwingle's final views on, 170, 171; views of Bullinger on, 179; "Concord" of Stuttgart on, between Blarer and Schnepff, 209; attempts to get some compromise generally accepted, 224; conferences with this object, 229; agreement of Bullinger and Calvin on it, 351; re-opened after Consensus of Zurich, 352; Schwenkfeldt's views on, 386.

Faber, leading French Humanist, i. 226; translates the Bible: flees to Strassburg, 227.
Faber, John, vicar-general of Constance, opposes Samson's traffic, i. 253, 254; and Zwingle's doctrines, 256; at Conference of Zurich, 293; disapproves it, but takes part, 295; at Diet of Speier, ii. 20; opposes Zwingle, 41; confutes Augsburg Confession, 123.
Fabricius sent to Münster to oppose the Anabaptists, ii. 217.
Farel, i. 227; his early career, 330; his disputation at Basel, 331–333; his marriage, 402, note; corresponds with Œcolampadius, 403; his bad opinion of Erasmus, ii. 80, note; first Reformer of Romanic Switzerland, 186; difficulties of his position, 187; his itinerant preaching, 187, 188; its power, 188, 189; his imprudence at Valangin, 189; and its consequences, 190, 191; rage excited by his preaching, 192, 193; arrives at Geneva, 196; his work there, 197; expelled by the priests, 197, 198; sent back by Bern Government, 202; installed in a church at Geneva: celebrates the Lord's Supper, 203; procures the abolition of the Romish rites, 204; contrasted with Zwingle and Œcolampadius, 205;

procures Calvin's stay at Geneva, 313; at Lausanne Disputation, 314; refuses to celebrate the communion: is banished, 317; goes to Neuchatel, 318; induces Calvin's return to Geneva, 321; at Servetus' execution, 338; at Calvin's death-bed, 344; visits Bullinger at Zurich with Calvin, 352; his interest in the Church of Locarno, 360.
Ferdinand, Archduke, at Diet of Worms, i. 135; acts for Charles v., 191; at Diet of Speier, ii. 4; becomes King of Hungary, 16; at Diet of Augsburg, 114; becomes Roman King or Emperor-elect, 156; receives Duchy of Wurtemberg, 207; resigns it to Duke Ulrich by Peace of Cadan, 208; joins Holy Alliance, 234; opens third Diet of Worms, 250; concludes Treaty of Passau, 295; opens Diet of Augsburg, 298.
Flacius, his attacks on Melanchthon's moderation, ii. 285; Melanchthon's reception of them, 286.
Flysted, his life and martyrdom, ii. 154.
Fontaines, Nicholas de, institutes prosecution of Servetus, ii. 335.
Fortmüller, his labours as Swiss Reformer, ii. 60; at Dissenhofen, 63.
Fossambrone, his share in foundation of the Capuchin Order, ii. 400.
France, its strength as rival of Austria, i. 26; its Italian policy, 27; progress of Reformation in, ii. 356.
Francis I., King of France, i. 27; his Swiss alliance, 33, 246; protects Faber, 227; defeated at Pavia, ii. 2; forms alliance against Charles v., 15; approves Schmalkaldic League, 159; abandons it, 235; concludes Peace of Crespy with Charles v., 249; annoyed at the Calvin-Copus discourse, 305; Calvin's *Institutes* dedicated to him, 307.
Franciscan monks, reformatory tendencies of, i. 195; their controversy at Bern with the Dominicans concerning the Virgin Mary, 258; Capuchins an offshoot from, ii. 399.
Franck, forerunner of modern metaphysicians, ii. 387; his pantheistic views, 388; his views of the Scriptures: his erratic life, 389.
Frankfort-on-Main, progress of Reformation at, i. 202, ii. 210, 211; truce between Schmalkaldic League and Holy Alliance concluded there, 235; Protestant Diet held there, 250.
Frecht persecuted for opposing Augsburg Interim, ii. 282; quarrels with Schwenkfeldt, 386.
Frederick I., King of Denmark, procures toleration of Lutherans, ii. 155; favours the Reformation, 221, 222.
Frederick, Elector-Palatine, opens Diet of Augsburg, ii. 116; communicates the emperor's decision to the Protestants, 125; negotiates for the emperor with the Schmalkaldic League, 160; has Bucer for chaplain, 226; at peace meeting of Frankfort, 235; presides at Diet of Regensburg, 242; procures tolerant Recess of Speier, 248; accepts Augsburg Interim, 280.
Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony, protects Luther, i. 30; founds Wittenberg University, 85; mediates on Luther's behalf at Rome, 104; his indecision in supporting Luther, 106, 107; regent of the empire, 30; 107; receives Luther at Worms, 134; approves his attitude there, 138; encourages Reformed preaching, 171; his hostility to the Zwickau "prophets," 175; desires Luther to remain at the Wartburg, 176; will not be responsible for him, 178; interview between him and Erasmus, 283; his charitable view of the Peasant War, 387 and note, and ii. 2; his death, 1; and character, 2.
Frederick, Duke of Schleswig, protects Reformation there, i. 210.
Freiburg, its opposition to Zwingle, i. 310, 337.
Froment begins to preach at Geneva, ii. 198; leaves the city, 199; returns, is ill received, 201; flees to Bern, 202.
Frosch, Reformed preacher at Augsburg, i. 205.
Frundsberg, encourages Luther at Worms, i. 135; at sack of Rome, ii. 15.
Furbity, Romanist preacher at Geneva, ii. 201; opposes the Reformers at Genevan Disputation: forced to recant, 202; is imprisoned, 203.

GAETANO of Thienne, founder of the Theatine Order, ii. 402.
Geiler, zeal and coarseness of his preaching, i. 39; his influence on Wimpheling, 74; and on Strassburg Reformation, 201.
Geneva, its important position, ii. 194; and political parties, 195; arrival of Farel there, 196; the city persecutes both him and Froment, 197–199; gathering of Protestants there, 199; great religious tumults there, 200; disputation there, 202; concedes tolera-

tion on demand of Bern: renounces allegiance to its bishop, 203; its Reformation finally established, 204; refuses the solicitations of the Duke of Savoy, 205; its tendency to sumptuary laws, 313; increased by Calvin, 314; its quarrel with Calvin, 316; it appeals to him to answer Cardinal Sadolet, 320; and recalls him, 321; its theocracy, 324; its ecclesiastical arrangements, 325, 326; its venerable company and consistory, 326; Reformed discipline finally established, 327; affair of Berthelier, 341; academy founded there, 342; its council's generosity to Calvin in sickness, 343.

George, Duke of Anhalt, his attitude to the Reformation, i. 119.

George, Duke of Saxony, at Leipsic Disputation, i. 116; hostile to Luther, 119; and to the Pope also, 131; blames Luther for Anabaptist excesses, 176; puts down Peasant War, 383; dies, ii. 236.

Gerbel, prominent in Strassburg Reformation, i. 201.

Germany, its constitution, i. 29, 31; its disorderly condition, 32; cultivation of its language, 32, 33; its Reformation contrasted with the Swiss, 290.

Geroldseck, Diebold von, summons Zwingle to Ensiedeln, i. 236; his friendship for Zwingle, 238.

Gessner, his correct apprehensions of natural phenomena, ii. 375.

Glapio wishes to dispute with Luther, i. 133; his controversy with Œcolampadius, 277.

Glareanus. *See* Loriti.

Goudimel sets the Psalms to music, ii. 376, 377.

Granvella disputes with the Reformers at Worms Conference, ii. 241; presides at Diet of Regensburg, 242; presses Augsburg Interim on Strassburg, 280; his hostility to Brenz, 281.

Grebel, his fanaticism, i. 298; his views on the Eucharist, 302, 303; his demagogic tendencies, ii. 24; his excesses, 25; flees from Zurich to Schaffhausen, 33; at St. Gall: examined by the Council of Zurich, 34.

Greek Church, its moderation compared with the Romish Church, ii. 415; proposed union of, with the Reformed Churches, 416.

Gregory I. introduces complete liturgical system, i. 12.

Gregory VII. introduces celibacy, i. 12.

Gropper, leading Romanist disputant at Diet of Regensburg, ii. 242; opposes Archbishop Hermann's reforms at Cologne, 248.

Gruet, his heterodox views: his execution, ii. 332.

Grumbach, Argula von Staufen, Baroness of, disputes with Eck, i. 207; is persecuted, 208.

Grynæus, professor at Basel, ii. 81; recommended to Ulrich of Wurtemberg, 208; attends Aarau Conference and Basel Conference, 229; receives Brenz at Basel, 281; friend of Calvin, 306; tries to moderate his zeal, 316.

Gustavus Vasa, King of Sweden, i. 28; favours the Reformation, 220, ii. 154.

Guttinara, imperial chancellor, his death injurious to the Protestants, ii. 112.

HAGENAU, religious conference at, ii. 240.

Halle, progress of Reformation there, ii. 238; Luther's interest in it, 238, 239.

Haller, Berthold, Swiss Reformer at Bern, i. 243, 263; his perils there, 326; his connection with Lambert, ii. 6; at Baden Disputation, 44; refuses to read mass, 49; at Bern Disputation, 57; goes to Marburg, 103; invited to Solothurn, 173; his views on Servetus' case, 337.

Haller, John, Swiss moral reformer, i. 257.

Hamilton, Patrick, Scottish proto-martyr, his life and martyrdom, ii. 153.

Hanseatic League, i. 31; its attitude to the Reformation, ii. 380.

Hätzer, iconoclast at Zurich, i. 297; preaches Anabaptism in Thurgau, ii. 63.

Hedio joins Reformers at Strassburg, i. 201; his opinion of Zwingle, 239; labours at Basel, 269; at Marburg Disputation, ii. 103; draws up Tetrapolitana, 125.

Heidelberg, conference at, i. 103; Brenz there, 198.

Heim, his controversy with Meyer at Bern, i. 329.

Held, Chancellor, visits Schmalkaldic League, ii. 233; and Catholic states, 235.

Henry II., King of France, unites with Maurice of Saxony against Charles V., ii. 290; invades Germany accordingly, 294; hostile to the Reformation, 355.

Henry VIII., King of England, his controversy with Luther, i. 187; coarseness of this controversy, 188; incites Erasmus to attack Luther, 288; his views on the Eucharist, 359; opposes Schmalkaldic League, ii. 159; secedes from Romanism, 362.
Henry, Duke of Brunswick, opposes the Reformation, i. 212; aids to suppress Peasant War, 384; attempts a compromise at Diet of Speier, ii. 21; joins Holy Alliance, 235; expelled from his dominions, 246.
Henry, Duke of Saxony, establishes the Reformation in his dominions, ii. 236; dies, 257.
Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, aids to suppress Münster Anabaptists, ii. 219; his liberal tendencies, 221; holds a council of reform, 247; procures the assistance of Bucer and Melanchthon, 248; deposed from his office by Charles V., 274.
Hess, his work as Reformer at Breslau, i. 215, 216.
Hesse, Eoban, supports Reuchlin, i. 55; praises Erasmus, 72; receives Luther at Erfurt, 132; preaches Reformed doctrines there, 170.
Hildesheim, progress of Reformation in, ii. 247.
Höflich preaches Reformed doctrines, i. 196; his persecutions, 197.
Hofmeister, Swiss Reformer, i. 243; at Conference of Zurich, 293; presides at second Conference there, 298; opposes Schmid there, 300; approves Schmid's closing address, 304; his work at Schaffhausen, 338; at Disputation of Ilanz, ii. 40.
Holy Alliance, formation of, ii. 234; it concludes Treaty of Frankfort, 235.
Homburg, Disputation of, ii. 7.
Honter, leading Reformer in Transylvania, ii. 357.
Hoogstraten opposes Reuchlin, i. 53; burns his *Augenspiel*, 54; satirized by Hutten, 56; opposes Luther's theses, 102; at trials of Voes and others, 223.
Hottinger, Zurich iconoclast, i. 297; his excesses, 298; his execution, 306, 307.
Hubmaier, at second Zurich Conference, i. 303; labours at St. Gall, 340; his connection with Münzer, ii. 23; his excesses, 25; sketch of his life, 35, 36; disputes with Zwingle on infant baptism, 37; flees from Waldshut: his subsequent wanderings, 38; his martyrdom, 39.
Humanists adore Erasmus, i. 72; mingle divine and human reverence, 73; their relation to Luther, 78; their views of theology, 87; finally diverge from the Reformation, ii. 370.
Hungary, progress of Reformation in, ii. 356, 357.
Hutten, his predilection for private war, i. 32; his literary influence, 33; friend of Erasmus and Reuchlin, 45; his poem on the Reuchlinian controversy, 55, 56; contributes to the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*, 56; his early life, and flight from the monastery, 58; his satirical genius, his *Roman Trinity*, 59; his opinion of Wimpheling, 75; his attitude to the Reformation, 123; attacks the bull published by Eck, 127; celebrates its burning by Luther, 130; at Basel, 182, 286; interferes to protect Ibach at Frankfort, 202; publishes private letters of Erasmus, 283; his quarrel with Erasmus, 285–287; goes from Basel to Mühlhausen and to Zurich, 287; dies there, 288.

Ibach preaches Reformed doctrines at Frankfort-on-Main, i. 202, ii. 210.
Ilanz, Disputation of, ii. 39–41.
Indulgences, growth of, i. 93; systematic farming of, 94, 95; ceremonies attending their sale, 95. *See* under Arcimboldi, Samson, Tetzel.
Inquisition, its work in Spain, ii. 361, 362; reorganization of, by Pope Paul III., 415.
Italy, its political disintegration, i. 27; its literary position, 28; progress of Reformation in, 228, and ii. 358.

James, Epistle of, rejected by Luther as an "epistle of straw," i. 159.
Jesuits, non-fortuitous origin of the Order, ii. 404; its formal foundation, 407; its rapid extension, 407, 408; its important character, 409.
Jetzer, his imposture at Bern, i. 258–262.
Jews, knowledge of Hebrew in Middle Ages confined to, i. 48; attack on them by Pfefferkorn, 50.
Joachim I. of Brandenburg disapproves Peace of Nuremberg, ii. 161; his zealous adherence to Catholicism, 235.
Joachim II. of Brandenburg offers to mediate between Schmalkaldic League and Holy Alliance, ii. 235; promotes the Reformation in his

dominions, 237 ; his firmness in the faith, 241 ; negotiates Recess of Speier, 248 ; intercedes for John Frederick of Saxony, 273 ; agrees to proposed Council, 289.
John Frederick I., Elector of Saxony, son of John the Stedfast, ii. 3 ; sent by his father to Cologne, 156 ; regent for his father : his accession, 162 ; rejects proposed General Council, 206, 207 ; at Westphalian Dietine, 219 ; refuses to commit himself to proposed Council, 224 ; at peace meeting of Frankfort, 235 ; firm against the pope, 241 ; approves Melanchthon's conduct at Regensburg : his dispute over see of Naumburg, 245 ; expels Henry of Brunswick from his dominions, 246; insists on Luther's burial at Wittenberg, 255 ; appeals to Charles v. for justice, 267 ; takes up arms against him, 268 ; defeated and captured at Mühlberg, 270 ; procures the surrender of Wittenberg, 272, 273; protests against Augsburg Interim, 280 ; his release and return to Saxony, 295 ; his opinion of Duke Maurice, 297 ; resigns his electorate, and dies, 298.
John Frederick II., son of above, succeeds his father, ii. 298.
John III., King of Portugal, procures mission of Rodriguez and Xavier to East Indies, ii. 408 ; invites Peter of Alcantara to Portugal, 412.
John the Stedfast, Elector of Saxony, aids to suppress Peasant War, i. 383; letter from his brother to him, 387 ; succeeds his brother, ii. 2 ; forms an alliance with Philip of Hesse, 3, 4 ; signs Protest of Speier, 21 ; repairs to Diet of Augsburg, 110 ; arrives there, 112 ; dissatisfied with the emperor's conduct, 115 ; consents to attend mass : signs Melanchthon's Confession, 116 ; obtains the title of Stedfast, 117 ; refused the Electoral Investiture, 123 ; leaves the Diet, 131 ; at Diet of Schmalkalden, 156 ; protests against King Ferdinand's election, 156, 157 ; refuses to admit the Swiss to the Schmalkaldic League, 158 ; rebuts Charles v.'s advances to him : joined with Philip of Hesse as head of the League, 160 ; dies, 162.
Jonas, Justus, visits Erasmus, i. 72 ; accompanies Luther to Worms, 132; his family life, 420 ; at Marburg, ii. 104 ; at Diet of Augsburg, 110; advises John Frederick I. against the General Council, 206 ; at Leipsic, 236 ; settles at Halle, 238 ; accompanies Luther to Eisleben, 253 ; present at his death, 255.
Juda, Leo, friend of Zwingle, i. 234 ; arrives at Zurich, 292 ; at second Conference there, 304 ; his energy as a Reformer, 325 ; his controversy with the Anabaptists, ii. 33 ; forced to hide himself, 181 ; preaches against Zurich Government, 182 ; effects of his preaching, 183 ; attends Conferences of Aarau and Basel, 229.
Julius III., his accession : re-summons the Council of Trent, ii. 288 ; dies, 299 ; persecutes Mollio, 359 ; appealed to by Peter of Alcantara to reform the Franciscans, 412.

Kaiser, his irregular execution, ii. 87 ; its effect on Swiss politics, 91.
Kappel, first war of, ii. 91 ; closed by Peace of Steinhausen, 94 ; second battle of, 164 ; its effects at Zurich, 172 ; and throughout Switzerland, 174.
Karlstadt (or Bodenstein), his combative character, i. 112 ; disputes with Eck on free-will, 117 ; compared with Luther, 121 ; violence of his opinions, 171 ; breach between him and Luther, 172 ; becomes entirely a demagogue, 186 ; opens Eucharistic controversy, 360-362 ; refused admission to Marburg Disputation, ii. 104 ; his connection with Schwenkfeldt, 384.
Karsthans, origin and meaning of the name, i. 229.
Kathrinenthal, violent suppression of the nunnery there, ii. 64.
Kaüfi elected abbot of St. Gall : his flight, ii. 163.
Kempe preaches Reformation doctrines at Hamburg, i. 211.
Kessler of St. Gall, his account of Melanchthon, i. 116 ; his journey to Wittenberg, 179 ; his interview with Luther in the inn, 180-184 ; his labours at St. Gall, 340.
Ketelhudt, Reformer in Pomerania, i. 214.
Kettenbach, Henry of, powerfully preaches the Reformation in Ulm, i. 197.
Knade, his marriage and persecutions, i. 214, 215.
Knipperdolling establishes Anabaptist theocracy in Münster, ii. 217 ; officiates in it as executioner, 218 ; his horrible death, 221.

Knipstro, Pomeranian Reformer, his sympathy with Luther, i. 214.
Knophen, Reformation preacher in Pomerania, i. 214.
Koch (or Wimpina) supports Tetzel against Luther, i. 100; confutes Augsburg Confession, ii. 123.
Kolb, political and religious reformer at Bern, i. 263; at Disputation there, ii. 57; dies, 174.
Kraft, Reformer at Fulda, i. 202; encouraged by Luther and Melanchthon, 203; at Homburg Disputation, ii. 7.
Kranach, Lucas, at Luther's marriage: his portraits of Luther and his wife, i. 401; accompanies John Frederick I. on his return to Saxony, ii. 295; takes Melanchthon's portrait after death, 354.
Krantz labours as Reformer at Hamburg, i. 211.
Krautwald embraces Schwenkfeldt's doctrines: abusively attacked by Luther, ii. 386.
Kürssner. *See* Pellican.

Lainez supports Crescentius at Council of Trent, ii. 399; joins the Jesuits, 406.
Lambert, Francis, French Reformer, ii. 5; his early career, 6; at Homburg Disputation: his work in Hesse, 7; his strict views and great success, 8; at Marburg Disputation, 104; adheres to Zwingle's views on the Eucharist, 107; his influence on Patrick Hamilton, 153.
Lambert of Thorn, his trial for heresy, i. 223, 224.
Landenberg, Hugo von, Bishop of Constance, his promises to Zwingle, i. 251; opposes Samson, 253; disputes with Zwingle about Zurich fasts, 291; protests against the Zurich Reformation, 310; driven from Constance, ii. 62.
Lange, Reformed preacher, i. 170; corresponds with Luther, 281.
Lasky, leading Polish Reformer, ii. 357, 358 and note.
Latin, remarks on its use by the Reformers, ii. 371, 372.
Leipsic, disputation there by Luther, Eck, and Karlstadt, i. 116; importance of these disputations, 116; its result favourable to the Reformation, 123; conference held there by Maurice of Saxony, nature of the interim then concluded, ii. 283.
Leo x. opposes Luther, i. 28; his infidelity, 36; protects Reuchlin, 53; his artistic tastes, 94; his scorn of Indulgence controversy, 103; dies, 188.
Leyden, John of, arrives at Münster, ii. 217; becomes its king, 218; his cruelty, 219, 220; his capture on the fall of the city, 220; his horrible death, 221.
Libertines, want of accurate knowledge of their tenets, ii. 330; their quarrels with Calvin, 341.
Limperger, Reformation preacher at Basel, ii. 51, 79.
Link corresponds with Luther, i. 146; preaches at Buchholz, 171.
Lismann, leading Polish Reformer, ii. 357.
Locarno, the Protestant Church there, ii. 360; exile of its members, 361; industries brought by them to Zurich, 380, note.
Loriti, friend of Zwingle, i. 236; lectures at Basel, 268; friend of Erasmus, 289; leaves Basel, ii. 79.
Loyola, founder of the Jesuits, ii. 404; his early life: his retirement at Montserrat, 405; his studies: his mystical character: originates the Order, 406; refuses to call it after himself, 407; dies, 408.
Luther, Hans, father of the Reformer, his social position, i. 79.
Luther, James, brother of the Reformer, accompanies him to Worms, i. 132; separated from him, 138.
Luther, Martin, really originates the Reformation, i. 22, 78; his literary influence, 33; connection between him and the Humanists, 78; his birth and family, 79; his education, 80; at Erfurt, 81; enters the monastery, 82; value of his experience there, 83, 84; timid about preaching, 85, 86; contrasted with Erasmus, 83, 87, 278, 289; at Wittenberg, 87; at Rome, 88, 89; his views of justification, 90, 91; begins his reformatory work on the defensive, 93; attacks the Indulgence system, 96; his theses, 97, 98; appeals to the bishops on them, 99; controversy excited by his theses, 100; challenges Tetzel to personal disputation, 101; his coarseness in controversy, 102; at Heidelberg Conference, 103; appeals to the pope, 104; summoned to Augsburg Diet: disputes there with Cajetan, 105; flees thence, 106; doubts his future course, 106, 107; examined by Miltitz, 108; again appeals to the pope: slow development of his views,

109 ; his attachment to the Church, 110 ; his friendship for Melanchthon, 115 ; disputes with Eck at Leipsic, 116, 117 ; supports some of the Hussite tenets, 119 ; accused of witchcraft, 120 ; described by Mosellanus, 121 ; superior to both Karlstadt and Eck, 122 ; supported by nobility, 123 ; publishes Reformation treatises, 125 ; again appeals to the pope, 126 ; his reception of Eck's bull, 128 ; publicly burns it, 129 ; importance of this action, 129, 130 ; summoned to Diet of Worms : his position, 131 ; journey thither, 132, 133 ; enters Worms, 134 ; before the Diet, 135–137 ; leaves Worms, 138 ; taken to Wartburg, 139 ; his life there, 139–144 ; his translation of the Bible, 143–150 ; its excellencies and defects, 145–150 ; its publication, 149 ; its position in German history, 151–154 ; his views of the Bible, 154–161 ; his treatises written at the Wartburg, 166–168 ; corresponds with Archbishop Albert, 167 ; and with Capito, 168 ; visits Witteuberg, 169 ; disapproves Karlstadt's violence, 172 ; his attitude to the Zwickau "prophets," 175 ; leaves the Wartburg : writes to the elector on this step, 176, 177 ; and to the Nuremberg Diet, 178 ; his interview with Kessler, 180–184 ; his tolerant views, 175, 184, 185 ; fails to calm the Zwickau "prophets," 186 ; coarseness of his controversy with Henry VIII., 187, 188 ; repudiates authority of custom, 190 ; unfavourably disposed towards Edict of Nuremberg, 192, 193 ; darkening of his life, 193, 194 ; writes to Reformers at Esslingen, 199 ; at Strassburg, 202 ; at Ratisbon, 205 ; at Ingolstadt, 207 ; at Worms, 208, 209 ; and at Miltenberg, 209 ; his letters and poem on Dutch persecutions, 225, 226 ; adheres to the pericopes, 241, and ii. 13 ; his doubtful attitude to Erasmus, i. 281, 282 ; contrasted with Hutten, 285 ; disputes with Erasmus on free-will, 289 ; parallel between him and Zwingle, 353–361, 377, 378 ; his influence on the Swiss Reformation, 354 ; his views of the Eucharist, 359, 360 ; origin of these views, 360–363 ; his treatise against Karlstadt, 363, 364 ; violently denounces Zwingle and Œcolampadius, 370 ; his partial sympathy with the Peasant War, 388–390 ; distinguishes reformation from revolution, 390, 391 ; his courtship and marriage, 400, 401 ; his severe sickness, 404 ; his trust in prayer, 405, 406 ; his family affection, 407, 411 ; his prayer in Melanchthon's sickness, 408 ; sees the necessity of recreation, 409 ; delights in nature, 413 ; his sociability, 415 ; his love of music, 416 ; careless in worldly affairs, 417, 418 ; his hospitality and charity, 418 ; establishes the mass in German, ii. 9 ; his views on the liturgy, 10, 11 ; and on private services, 12 ; his catechisms, 13, 19, 20 ; his preaching, and opinion of ordinances, 14 ; his scruples about League of Rotach, 22 ; his political views compared with Zwingle's, 88–91 ; violence of his Eucharistic treatises, 97, 100 ; hopes little from Disputation at Marburg, 103 ; arrives there, 104 ; his violent conduct there, 105, 106 ; objects to leagues against the emperor : his expectations from Diet of Augsburg, 109 ; goes thither, but remains at Coburg, 110 ; his life there, 111, 112 ; writes to Melanchthon on his Confession, 116 ; and on its confutation, 124 ; his opinion of the Augsburg Recess, 131 ; contrasted with Zwingle, 137–140 ; their substantial agreement, 140 ; disapproves Philip of Hesse's Swiss alliance, 157 ; but agrees to recognise the Tetrapolitans, 159 ; his unseemly view of Zwingle's death, 166 ; advises John Frederick I. against the General Council, 206 ; warns the Münster Protestants, 215 ; his views on fall of Münster, 222 ; his interview with Vergerio, 223 ; his harsh views of the Zwinglians, 227 ; objects to all political alliance with them, 228 ; his temporary concessions to Bucer, 230 ; writes to Burgomaster Meyer, 231 ; and to the Confederate States, 232 ; draws up Schmalkaldic Confession for Mantuan Council, 233 ; his hostility to the pope, 234 ; preaches at Leipsic, 236 ; writes to Protestants at Halle, 238, 239 ; dissatisfied with Regensburg Interim, 243 ; false reports of his death circulated : resolves to leave Wittenberg, 251 ; comparative calm of his later years, 252 ; journeys to Eisleben, 253 ; attacked there by sickness, 254 ; dies, 255 ; his funeral, 255, 256 ; subsequent history of his family, 257 ; nature of his greatness reviewed, 258–260 ; predominance

of his faith, and of his German character, 263; his too controversial bent, 265; permanence of his hostility to Zwingle, 265, note; his tomb respected by Charles v., 275; his attitude to Calvin, 321; disapproves doctrinal persecutions, 340; his superstitious views of natural phenomena, 375; his views of amusements compared with Calvin's, 381.

Magdeburg, League of, ii. 4; rejects Augsburg Interim, 280; besieged by Maurice of Saxony, 289; its capture by him, and moderation of his terms, 290.

Major, Wittenberg theologian, his share in Melanchthon's obsequies, ii. 354.

Mansfeld, Counts of, their disagreement referred to Luther, ii. 253; Count Albert visits him in sickness, 254; they desire his burial at Eisleben, 255; but escort the funeral to Wittenberg, 256.

Manuel, Bernese satirist of the Church, i. 265; his poem on Baden Disputation, ii. 43; sent to Basel, 72.

Manz, Swiss Anabaptist, ii. 24, 25; drowned at Zurich, 34.

Marburg, University there, ii. 8; projected Eucharistic disputation at, 22; preparation for it, 103; its beginning, 104; incidents of, 105, 106; articles agreed upon there, 106, 107.

Margaret, Queen of Navarre, protects French Reformers, i. 247; including Calvin, ii. 305; his correspondence with her, 347.

Marinari opposes certain decrees of the Council of Trent, ii. 397, 398.

Mariolatry, its rise, i. 13.

Marius opposes Œcolampadius at Basel, ii. 52; leaves Basel, 74.

Marot, his metrical version of the Psalms, ii. 377.

Mary, Queen of England, persecutes the Protestants, ii. 364.

Mary, Regent of the Netherlands, intercedes for Philip of Hesse, ii. 292; compelled by her position to persecute the Protestants, 356.

Matthesius, his account of Staupitz, i. 84, note; writes Luther's biography, 88; his comments on Luther at Worms, 134; on Luther's vehemence, 393; on Luther at Coburg, ii. 110.

Matthias, his arrival at Münster, ii. 217; his death, 218.

Maurice, Duke of Saxony, succeeds his father, ii. 236; invades the Saxon electorate for Charles v., 269; receives it from the emperor, 273; takes possession of Wittenberg, 275; his attitude favourable to Protestantism, 276; disapproves the Augsburg Interim, 280; holds religious conferences terminating in Leipsic Interim, 283; rejects the proposed Council: besieges Magdeburg, 289; captures it: forms designs against Charles v., 290; his grief for Philip of Hesse's sufferings, 291; makes war on the emperor, 294; his victories, 294, 295; concludes Treaty of Passau, 295; dies, 297; his character, 297, and note; gives the Reformation a political character, 369.

Maximilian I., i. 26; divides the empire into circles, 31; establishes "public peace," 32; tries to suppress Reuchlinian controversy, 53; dies, 107.

Mebler, Reformation preacher at Naumburg-Zeitz, ii. 245.

Megander, labours with Zwingle at Zurich, i. 325; at Bern Disputation, ii. 55; and at Basel Conference, 229.

Melanchthon, his education, i. 112, 113; his learning: link between Erasmus and Luther, 114; popular as a teacher: importance of his relations with Luther, 115; goes with Luther and Karlstadt to Leipsic, 116; impressed with Luther's demeanour there, 119; his share in translating the Bible, 146; his *Manual of Doctrine*, 161–166; his Augustinianism, 162–164; his views on the Eucharist, 165, 166; visited by Luther at Wittenberg, 169; his doubts of the Zwickau "prophets," 174, 175; his friendship for Eberlin, 196; visits Kraft at Fulda, 203; his aristocratic views on Peasant War, 386; his theory of divine right, 386, 387; his severe sickness at Weimar, 408; rebuked by Luther for over-study, 409; his family life, 419; his studious habits, 420; his interview with Philip of Hesse, ii. 3; goes to Marburg, 104; at Diet of Augsburg, 110; draws up Augsburg Confession, 116; his opinion of its confutation, 123; his apology for the Confession, 125; draws up Schmalkaldic Declaration, 157, 158; advises John Frederick I. against General Council, 206; desires settlement of the Eucharistic controversy,

228; his comparatively mild views of the pope, 234; sets out for Hagenau Conference, but is detained by sickness, 240; meets Calvin at Worms, 241; disputes with the Romanists at Diet of Regensburg, 242; regrets his concessions, 244; draws up *Wittenbergische Reformation*, 250; his feelings on Luther's death, 256, 257; assists to draw up Leipsic Interim, 283; his painful position, 284, 285; his reception of Flacius' attack, 286; encouraged by Bucer and Philip of Hesse, 287; visits the Council with Hessian Confession, 289; welcomes John Frederick I. on his release, 295; approves punishing heresy, 340; his last days, 352, 353; his death and burial, 354; his estimation of Aristotle, 373; his astrological tendencies, 375; performs Philip of Hesse's second marriage, 378, note; opposes Schwenkfeldt, 387; attempts union with the Greek Church, 416.

Melander, Protestant preacher at Augsburg, ii. 211; preaches on conquest of Brunswick, 246.

Meltinger, i. 267; his conduct in Basel insurrection, 397; hostile to the Reformation, ii. 71; his temporizing conduct, 74, 75; flees from Basel, 76.

Memmingen presides at second Zurich Conference, i. 298.

Meyer, Adelberg, burgomaster in Basel, i. 267; his conduct in Röublin's case, 271; and in Basel insurrection, 397; shares in Reformation victory there, ii. 71.

Meyer, James, guildmaster of Basel, ii. 71; Luther's regard for him, 231, 232.

Meyer, Peter, opposes Ibach at Frankfort, i. 202.

Meyer, Sebastian, Swiss Reformer, i. 264; at Conference of Zurich, 293–295; his perilous position at Bern, 326; his controversy with Heim, 329.

Miani founds the Order of Somaskers: his charities, ii. 403.

Miltitz sent on embassy to Saxony, i. 107; confers with Luther, 108; advises him to conciliate the pope, 126.

Moller labours as Reformer at Bremen, i. 211, 212; his martyrdom, 212.

Mollio, his powerful Reformation preaching in Italy, ii. 358; his trial and martyrdom, 359.

Monasticism, advantages of: decline of, i. 10; its asceticism causes its laxity, 11; its influence on the Church, 12; rivalry of its orders, 41; rise of new orders, ii. 399.

Montfaucon, Bishop of Lausanne, tries to silence John Haller, 257; enshrines false relics of St. Anna, 262, 263; accuses Bernese Reformers of heresy, 264.

More, Sir Thomas, friend of Erasmus, i. 64, 68; hostile to the monks, 68, note; his Eucharistic views, 368.

Mosellanus presides at Leipsic Disputation, i. 116; his account of the Disputation, 120 et seq.

Mühlberg, battle of, ii. 270.

Mühlhausen, Hutten there, i. 287; its Reformation, 336.

Münster, professor at Basel, ii. 81, 82.

Münster, beginnings of Reformation there, ii. 213; Anabaptist excesses at, 217; polygamy established at, 218; attempts made to suppress its crimes, 219; its siege and capture, 220; effects of its capture on Protestantism generally, 221.

Münzer, one of the Zwickau "prophets," i. 173; his share in Peasant War, 378; his low opinion of Luther, 381; his excesses, 382; limits his operations to Saxony, 383; his execution, 384; his career in Switzerland, ii. 23; influences Hubmaier, 36.

Murner, his controversy in rhyme with Stiefel, i. 199; satirized in popular ballads, 229; his talents as a satirist, ii. 42; his violent language at Baden Disputation, 47.

Myconius, Felix, son of Oswald Myconius, his scruples about classical study, ii. 372.

Myconius, Frederick, his account of Luther's journey to Worms, i. 133; preaches Reformed doctrines, 170; labours at Leipsic, ii. 237.

Myconius, Oswald, procures Zwingle's call to Zurich, i. 239; his place in Swiss Reformation, 243; assists Zwingle at Zurich, 325; expelled from Lucerne, 344; professor at Basel, ii. 82; his opinion of Augsburg Confession, 123; succeeds Œcolampadius, 176; persecuted at Zurich, 181; sketch of his life, 184; his work at Basel, 184, 185; attends Aarau and Basel Conferences, 229.

Mysticism supplies wants of Scholasticism, i. 15; its influence on Luther, 87.

Nassau, Count of, negotiates with John of Saxony for the emperor, ii. 112, 159.

Naumburg-Zeitz, bishopric of, dispute

over its succession, ii. 245; Treaty of, between Augustus and John Frederick of Saxony, 298.
Neri. *See* Philip of.
Netherlands, progress of Reformation, ii. 356.
Neuchatel, Farel preaches there, ii. 188; course of Reformation there, 189; its triumph, 191.
Nuremberg, fame of, i. 31; progress of Reformation at, 203; Diet of: peace concluded there between Protestants and Catholics, ii. 161; renewal of the peace, 244.

Oberhasli-thal, Romanist reaction at, ii. 58; suppressed by Bern, 59.
Occhino, the brothers, join in Valdez' "Blessed Fellowship" in Naples, ii. 358; Bernardino comes to England, 364; his previous connection with the Capuchins, 401.
Odense, Diet of, Danish Reformation established there, ii. 155.
Œchslin at Zurich, i. 238; and at Thurgau, 338; at Baden Disputation, ii. 44.
Œcolampadius, his testimony to the contempt of sacred things, i. 39, 40; studies under Reuchlin, 49, 276; teaches Brenz Greek, 198; adopts Zwingle's style of preaching, 241; his birth and education, 275, 276; his monastic retirement: chaplain to Francis von Sickingen, 277; his work at Basel, 278; refuses to attend Zurich Conference, 293; receives Farel at Basel, 330; his reforms there, 334; his views on the Eucharistic controversy, 365-367; his treatise on that subject, 368-370; his desire for peace, 371, 372; his marriage, 402; his family, 403; his affection for them, 407, note; disputes with the Anabaptists, ii. 34; at Disputation of Baden, 43; his success there, 45, 46; but is excommunicated, 47; false rumours of his recantation, 48; his difficult position at Basel: introduces German psalm-singing, 50; his catechisms, 51; disputes with Marius, 52; consequent disturbances, 53; at Bern Disputation, 55: institutes a church visitation, 68; professor in Basel University, 82; opposes Luther in Eucharistic controversy, 102; sets out for Marburg, 103; his sickness, 174; dies, 175; his character, 176; friend of Farel, 187.
Oetenbach, nunnery of, Zwingle preaches there, i. 315
Olivetanus translates the Bible, ii. 199; kinsman of Calvin: his influence on him, 304.
Oposinus, printer and publisher at Basel, receives Castellio, ii. 329; reference to his father's abandonment of art, 376.
Ortwin satirizes Reuchlin, i. 53; is himself satirized by Hutten: the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum* addressed to him, 56.
Osiander, Reformation preacher at Nuremberg, i. 204; at Marburg, ii. 104; at Worms Conference, 244; his work at Neuburg, 247.

Pack, his fictitious plot, ii. 16, 17.
Paleario, Aonio, probable author of the *Del beneficio di Christo*: his life and martyrdom, ii. 360; reception of that book, 359.
Papacy, its advantages, i. 8, 9; its decline, 10; its expenses, 93, 94.
Passau, Treaty of, concluded between King Ferdinand and Maurice of Saxony, ii. 295; its provisions, 296.
Paul III., his accession: his liberal tendencies, ii. 228; summons Œcumenical Council at Mantua, 233; opposed to Recess of Speier, 249; issues a bull against Schmalkaldic League, 267; adjourns the Council of Trent to Bologna, 276; dies, 288; authorizes Pauline Order, 401; and Order of Jesuits, 407; gives it new privileges, 408; reorganizes the Inquisition, 415.
Paulines or Barnabites, Order of, its constitution and character, ii. 401.
Peasant War, early outbreaks of, i. 379; caused by the Reformation, 380; its Twelve Articles: its excesses, 382; its bloody course, 383; its bad effects on the country, 384; not exclusively a Reformation movement, 385.
Pellican, Reformer at Basel, i. 270: abandons his Order, 330.
Perrin, his hostility to Calvin, his subsequent banishment, ii. 332; his efforts on behalf of Servetus, 337; returns to Geneva, 341; forced to leave, 342.
Peter of Alcantara, ii. 410; his ascetic life, 411; rigour of his religion, 412; his death: his influence on St. Theresa, 413.
Peterson, Swedish Reformer, i. 219; favoured by Gustavus Vasa, 220; at Diet of Westerås, ii. 154.
Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, i. 419; fears for Melanchthon's health,

ii. 353; present at his death-bed, 354.
Pfefferkorn, his attacks on the Jews, i. 50; and on Reuchlin, 52.
Pfeffinger, John, of Leipsic, ii. 238; prepares Leipsic Interim, 283.
Pfeifer, renegade monk, takes part in the Peasant War, i. 381.
Pflug, Julius von, at Diet of Regensburg, ii. 242; elected Bishop of Naumburg, 245; employed by Charles v. to draw up Augsburg Interim, 278.
Philip, Archduke of Austria, son of Maxmilian I., father of Charles v., marries Joanna, i. 26.
Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse, supports Luther at Worms, i. 138; puts down Peasant War, 383; his alliance with John of Saxony, ii. 2; his accession and character, 3; friend of Luther, Melanchthon, and Zwingle, 4; at Diet of Speier: his zeal for the Reformation, 5; signs Protest of Speier, 21; wishes disputation on the Eucharist, 22; his hospitality at Marburg Disputation, 104; wishes to reconcile Luther to Zwingle, 106; embraces Zwingle's Eucharistic views, 108; at Diet of Augsburg, 112; protests against the emperor's mandate, 115; signs Melanchthon's Confession, 116; leaves the Diet, 123; concludes alliance with Swiss Reformed cantons: at Diet of Schmalkalden, 156; joint-head of the League with John of Saxony, 160; dissatisfied with Peace of Nuremberg, 162; reinstates Ulrich of Wurtemberg, 207; mediates in Münster Reformation, 215; aids to suppress Münster Anabaptists, 219; at peace meeting of Frankfort, 235; and Diet of Regensburg, 241; expels Henry of Brunswick from his dominions, 246; his defiant letter to the emperor, 267; takes arms against him, 268; quarrels with Schärtlin, 269; surrenders to the emperor, 273; is imprisoned, 274; his conduct in captivity, 280; writes to encourage Melanchthon, 287; length of his captivity, 289; his sufferings, 290; complains to Maurice, 291; fruitless intercessions made for him, 292; his religious consolations, 293; renewed efforts for his deliverance, 294; his final release and return to Hesse, 296; his opinion of Maurice of Saxony, 297; represents the political side of the Reformation, 362; scandal of his bigamous marriage, 377, 378, note.
Philip of Neri, his mystical ecstasies, ii. 409; his practical religion: his death, 410.
Pirckheimer, eminent Humanist, i. 53; Reformer at Nuremberg, 203; his Eucharistic views, 370.
Pius IV. testifies to Calvin's disinterestedness, ii. 343; reopens Council of Trent, 399.
Poland, progress of Reformation in, ii. 357.
Polenz, Bishop of Samland, joins the Reformers, i. 216, 217.
Prierias supports Dominicans against Reuchlin, i. 54; and Tetzel against Luther, 101.
Protest of Speier, ii. 21.

Reformation divides mediæval and modern church history, i. 1; its place in history disputed, 2, 3; forerunners of, 19, 42; excesses in, 20; centres in Germany, 23; periods of, 24; its law-abiding character, 171; not responsible for fanatical excesses, 174; becomes great European question, 192; its rapid and unsystematic extension, 195; its course in Germany and in Switzerland contrasted, 346–349; its true character investigated, ii. 140–142; prominence given by it to the person of Christ, 146–149; its operation primarily religious, 367; its indirect influence on politics, 368, 369; on science, 370–373; on philosophy, 373; on history and natural philosophy, 374; on art, 375, 376; on morals, 377–379; on schools, 379; on civil and domestic life, 380; on public amusements, 381; on family life, 382.
Regensburg, Diet of, ii. 241–243; Interim agreed upon, 243; progress of Reformation at, 247.
Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, gives protection to Calvin, ii. 312; his letter to her, 348.
Reuchlin, his early life at Paris University, i. 45; at Basel studies Greek and law, 46; employed diplomatically: his death, 47; zealous in study of Greek and Hebrew, 48; practises the Cabala, 49; his tolerant views of the Jews, 50, 51; quarrels with Pfefferkorn, 52, 53; decision in his favour at Rome, 54; dream of his death: his supporters in the Jewish controversy, 55; praises Wimpheling, 75; teaches Eck, 103; patronizes Melanchthon, 113.

Rhegius, Urbanus, Reformer at Augsburg, i. 205; and at Ulm, 370.
Ridley, English Reformer, ii. 363; his martyrdom, 364.
Ritter, his work at Schaffhausen, ii. 85, 86.
Riverta, Papal legate, procures banishment of Locarnese Protestants, ii. 361.
Rodriguez joins the Jesuits, ii. 406; goes as missionary to the East Indies, 408.
Rottmann, Reformation preacher at Münster, ii. 214; his attitude to the Anabaptists, 216; finally joins them, 218; falls in siege of Münster, 220.
Röublin, Reformer at Basel, i. 270; expelled by the priests, 271; his disorderly conduct at Zurich, 290, note; joins the Anabaptists, 333, and ii. 24.
Roussel, French Reformer, i. 227.
Röust, burgomaster of Zurich, supports Zwingle there, i. 240; and John Haller, 257; opens Conference of Zurich, 293; at second Zurich Conference, 304; and at Bern Disputation, ii. 54.
Rubianus, Crotus, author of the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*, 156; their character, 57; induces Hutten to go to Erfurt, 58; receives Luther at Erfurt, 132.

Sachs, Hans, poet of the Nuremberg Reformation, i. 33; his admiration of Luther, 203.
Sadolet, Cardinal, his letter to Geneva, ii. 320; visits Calvin, 344; warns Paleario, 360.
St. Gall, disputed succession to its abbey, ii. 162.
Salmeron supports Crescentius at Council of Trent, ii. 399; joins the Jesuits, 406.
Sam, principal Reformer at Ulm, i. 197.
Samson sells indulgences in Switzerland, i. 95, 244; his conduct and reception, 251–254.
Saunier accompanies Farel to Geneva, ii. 196; is banished thence, 317.
Saxony, partition of, i. 30; visitation of its churches, ii. 17; their bad condition, 18; second partition of, by Treaty of Naumburg, 296.
Schachtorp, circumstances attending his death, ii. 212.
Schappeler, Reformation preacher at Memmingen, i. 206.
Schärtlin commands upland contingent of Protestant army, ii. 268; quarrels with the Landgrave Philip, 269.
Schenk preaches under the protection of Henry of Saxony, ii. 236.
Schinner, Bishop of Sitten, appears to favour Zwingle, i. 251; assists to expose the Jetzer affair, 262; native of Valais, 342.
Schlegel, abbot of St. Lucien, defends Romanist doctrines at Ilanz Disputation, ii. 39, 40.
Schleswig, progress of Reformation in, i. 210.
Schmalkalden, League of, ii. 108; second Diet of, 157; its inconclusive result: its third meeting, 157; the League formed: its objects: the Swiss excluded, 158; it is consummated at Frankfort, 160; recognises Ferdinand as Roman king, 208; puts off Vergerio's demand for a Council, 224; finally refuses it, 233; concludes truce of Frankfort, 235; meets at Frankfort-on-Main, 250; finally breaks with Charles v., 267; is annihilated, 274; condemns Schwenkfeldt's tenets, 387.
Schmid at second Zurich Conference, i. 299; his moderation opposed by Zwingle, 300; disputes with him on the Eucharist, 302; his address in closing the Conference, 303; preaches at Lucerne, 345; at Bern Disputation, ii. 55; chaplain to Zurich army, 92; killed at battle of Kappel, 166.
Schnepff, Reformation preacher, i. 205; his Lutheran views of the Eucharist, 369; at Diet of Augsburg, ii. 112; compromises the Eucharistic controversy: his work at Wurtemberg, 209; refuses to accept Augsburg Interim: his consequent discharge, 281.
Schofer, Arsacius, his persecution, i. 207.
Scholasticism, importance of, i. 14; separates faith and knowledge, 15; repudiated by Luther, 87.
Schurf accompanies Luther to Worms, i. 132; recommended by Luther to Kessler, 180; defends Magdeburg Reformation, 219.
Schurtanner, friend of Zwingle, *The Shepherd* addressed to him, i. 320; his work at Taufen, 341.
Schwabach-Torgau, articles of, ii. 108.
Schwenkfeldt, sketch of his life, ii. 384; attacks the Reformed clergy, 385; fails in propagating his opinions: dies, 387.
Servetus, ii. 334; sketch of his life and tenets, 335; his views of the Trinity: his defiant character, 336; different views of his crime, 337; his sentence and his reception of it, 338; his

execution, 338, 339; public opinion on this affair, 339; its effects on Calvin and the Reformation, 340.
Sickingen, Franz von, i. 32; approves the Reformation, 123; offers shelter to Luther, 133; friend of Eberlin, 196; shelters Schwebel, 200; and Œcolampadius, 277; dies, 277, 285; friend of Bucer, ii. 226.
Silva, Diego de, Inquisitor in Spain, ii. 361.
Simler, teacher of Melanchthon, i. 113; and of Berthold Haller, 263.
Solothurn, disturbances there, ii. 173.
Somaskers, Order of, its origin, ii. 402; its character, 403.
Spalatin, court preacher to Frederick the Wise, i. 107; dissuades Luther from going to Worms, 134; confers with Frederick about Luther, 138; negotiates between Frederick and Luther, 175; corresponds with Luther, 281, 282; his relations with Erasmus, 284; at Diet of Augsburg, ii. 110.
Speier, Diet of, ii. 4; its tolerant resolutions, 5; second Diet there, 20; third Diet there: its compromising Recess, 246.
Speratus, his work as Reformer, i. 196; labours at Königsberg, 216; his poetical talents, ii. 376.
Spiera, his antinomian tendencies, ii. 392; his apostasy and death, 393.
Spreng, Reformation preacher at Bremen, i. 212; his bad reception at Antwerp, 222.
Staupitz, his reformatory tendencies, i. 43; his connection with Luther, 84–86; assists to found Wittenberg University, 85; Luther's opinion of him, 92; helps Luther's flight from Augsburg, 106.
Steiner, friend of Bullinger, ii. 178; receives him at Zurich, 180.
Steinlin opposes Zwingle's views on the Eucharist at Zurich Conference, i. 302.
Stiefel, his high opinion of Luther, i. 199; his downward course, 199, 200, and note.
Stör, his disputation at Basel: becomes Anabaptist, i. 333; shares in Peasants' Insurrection at Basel, 398; his excesses in Thurgau, ii. 63.
Storch, one of the Zwickau "prophets," i. 173.
Storm, burgomaster of Magdeburg, corresponds with Luther and begins Reformation there, i. 218.
Strassburg, Reformation centre, i. 201; puts forth Tetrapolitan Confession, ii. 125; rejects Augsburg Interim, 280.
Strauss abuses the Zwinglians, i. 374; shares in Peasant War, 375.
Stubner, Zwickau "prophet," despises human learning, i. 173; tries to impress Luther, 185, note.
Stumpf, fanatic Swiss Reformer, i. 292, 298.
Sturm, his connection with Wimpheling, i. 75.
Sturm, burgomaster of Strassburg, at first War of Kappel, ii. 93; goes to Marburg, 103.
Stuttgart, Disputation of, ii. 209.
Sulzer, Reformation preacher at Basel, ii. 337.
Switzerland allied with France, i. 33; its confederate constitution and mercenary character, 34; derives its Reformation from Luther, 226; contrasted with that of Germany, 243, 256; its disintegration, 246, 247; its ecclesiastical condition, 249, 250; slowness of Reformation in its inland districts, 345; insurrection of its peasantry, 394; Romish and Evangelical Leagues in, ii. 87; refused admission to Schmalkaldic League, 158; difference between its Germanic and Romanic Reformations, 205; its Reformation largely political, 369.

Tast, Reformation preacher at Schleswig, i. 210; in Denmark, 222.
Tauler, i. 18; favourite author of Luther, 84; prepares Strassburg for Reformation, 201.
Tausen, prominent Danish Reformer, ii. 155.
Tetrapolitana compared with Augsburg Confession, ii. 125, 126; its supporters admitted to Schmalkaldic League, 156, 158.
Tetzel employed in sale of indulgences, i. 95; arrives at Wittenberg, 96; replies to Luther's thesis, 100; his dishonesty: his death, 108.
Thamer, professor at Marburg, repudiates Lutheran justification, ii. 390; goes back to Romanism: his later life: his death, 391.
Theatine Order, its foundation and character, ii. 402.
Theresa, St., her early life: enters Order of Capuchin Nuns: her connection with Peter of Alcantara, ii. 413; founds Order of Unshod Carmelitesses: dies, 414.
Thurgau, Reformation in, ii. 63; excesses connected with it, 64, 65.
Tillet gives shelter to Calvin, ii. 305; recommends him to Farel, 312.
Transylvania, Reformation in, ii. 357.

Trebonius teaches Luther at Eisenach, i. 80.
Treger, leading Romanist at Bern Disputation, ii. 57.
Trent, Council of, its meeting, ii. 249; threatened by Schärtlin, 268; adjourned to Bologna, 276; recalled to Trent by Julius III., 288; its formal opening, 396; its decrees on Scripture, 397, 398; on justification and the sacrament, 398; adjourns from fear of Maurice of Saxony: its subsequent sessions, 399.
Tschudi, priest of Glarus, his temporizing policy, ii. 86.
Tungern opposes Reuchlin, i. 53; condemns Clarenbach, ii. 152.
Turks, aggressions of, i. 28, 29; tax to resist them, 94; their attacks necessitate Diet of Augsburg, ii. 109; they invade Transylvania, 295.

Ulrich, Duke of Wurtemburg, expelled from and reinstated in his dominions, ii. 207; establishes the Reformation, 208; procures compromise of the Eucharistic controversy, 209; joins the Schmalkaldic League, 224; accepts Augsburg Interim, 280.
Ittenheim, Christopher von, Bishop of Basel, his Evangelical tendencies, i. 267; dies, ii. 79.

Vadian, Swiss Reformer, i. 233, 243; presides at second Zurich Conference, 298; his speech in closing the Conference, 304; labours in St. Gall, 339; brother-in-law to Grebel, ii. 24; presides at Bern Disputation, 57; completes Reformation at St. Gall, 85; opposes Schwenkfeldt, 387.
Valdez, Spanish Reformer in Italy, his "Blessed Fellowship," ii. 358.
Valer, early Spanish Protestant, his imprisonment, ii. 361.
Vergerio, Papal legate, his interview with Luther, ii. 223; presses the meeting of Œcumenical Council, 224; at Spiera's death-bed, 393.
Vernli, his violent death in Genevan riots, ii. 200; its effects, 201.
Viret preaches along with Farel, ii. 193; celebrates the Lord's Supper with him, 203; at Lausanne Disputation, pastor there, 314; induces Calvin's return to Geneva, 321; tries to silence Bolsec, 333.
Voes, his martyrdom, i. 223, 224.

Waldeck, Francis von, Bishop of Minden, vainly opposes Münster Reformation, ii. 214.
Waldenses, i. 43.
Wessel, his position as proto-Reformer, i. 42; his connection with Reuchlin, 46.
Westerås, Diet of, Swedish Reformation established there, ii. 154.
Westphal opposes Consensus of Zurich, ii. 352.
Westphalia, progress of Reformation in, ii. 211; at Soest, 212; and at Paderborn, 213.
Wicel, his Humanistic tendencies, ii. 391; his perversion and subsequent history, 392.
William, Duke of Bavaria, hostile to the Reformation, i. 206, 207; his views of Augsburg Confession, ii. 122; joins Holy Alliance, 235.
William, Duke of Cleves, assists to suppress Münster Anabaptists, ii. 219; establishes the Reformation, 247.
William, son of Philip of Hesse, intercedes for his father, ii. 292; his father's letter to him, 293; he takes the field with Maurice of Saxony, 294.
Wimpheling, his attitude to the Humanists and Mystics, i. 74; his position in the Reformation, 75, 201; his popularity, 75, 76.
Wimpina. *See* Koch.
Winkler, Reformation preacher at Halle, his martyrdom, ii. 237.
Winsheim preaches Melanchthon's funeral sermon, ii. 354.
Wittenberg, foundation of its University, ii. 85; privileges of its Church, 97; rivalry between Universities there and at Frankfort, 100; centre of Lutheran influence, 170; disturbances caused there by Zwickau "prophets," 176; Concord of, ii. 230; excesses there drive out Luther for a time, 251; besieged by the Emperor, 270; surrenders, 273; acknowledges Maurice of Saxony, 275.
Wölflin, teacher of Zwingle, i. 232; favours Samson, 252; his credulity in the Jetzer affair, 260.
Worms, Diet of, i. 131; its imposing character, 135; progress of Reformation there, 208; second Diet there, ii. 219; third Diet there, 250.
Wurtemberg, expulsion of Duke Ulrich of: he is restored by Philip of Hesse, ii. 207.
Wyssenburger, his success as Reformer at Basel, i. 292.

Wyttenbach, theological professor at Basel, i. 233; his lectures, 268; at Bern, 327; at Biel, 336; his death, ii. 59.

Xavier, Francis, with Loyola in Paris, ii. 406; goes as missionary to the East Indies, 408.

Zell, leading Strassburg Reformer, i. 201, ii. 226.
Zurich, its moral condition, i. 240; Reformers' labours there, 254; on outbreak of plague, 255; peculiarities of Reformation there, 290; Conference held there, 293; its unsatisfactory results, 295; dissolution of convents there, 296; iconoclastic outbreak, 297; checked by the Government, 298; second Conference there, 298; its satisfactory result, 305; the Government finally establishes the Reformation, 306–309; third Conference of, 308; its effects on the other Swiss states, 310; persecution of Anabaptists, ii. 33, 34; reaction there after Baden Disputation, 49; gathering there before Bern Disputation, 54; its alliance with Bern, 59; its hostility to the Romish cantons, 91; concludes Peace of Steinhausen, 94; its alliance with Philip of Hesse, 156; makes war on the Romish cantons, 164; effects produced there by battle of Kappel, 172; temporary Romanist reaction there, 182; Conference at and Consensus of, 352; receives the Locarnese exiles, 361.
Zwick, Reformer at Constance, ii. 61; his previous career, 61, 62.
Zwickau, "prophets" of, their tenets, i. 173; leave Wittenberg, 186.
Zwingle, earliness of his Reformation tendencies, i. 22; his account of the monastic orders, 41; favoured by Pope Adrian vi., 129; birth and education of, 231–233; his zeal for study, 234; his political views, 235, 247; his friendship for Erasmus, 235, 289; goes to Ensiedeln, 236; his moral reputation, 236, note; his position at Ensiedeln, 238; his conservative tendencies: his call to Zurich, 239; his new style of preaching, 240, 241; its practical character, 242; independent of Luther, 244, 245; his expectations from Schinner, 251; exposes Samson's indulgence traffic, 251, 254; attacked by plague, 255; charges brought against him, 256; his *Plague Hymns*, 273, 274; receives Hutten at Zurich, 288; his rational view of fasting, 291; tries to bring about a thorough Reformation, 292; at Conference of Zurich, 293; protected by decree of the Council, 295; his iconoclastic moderation, 297; opposes Schmid at second Zurich Conference, 300; his Eucharistic views, 301, 302; draws up instructions to preachers, 307; procures establishment of his Eucharistic views, 311, 312; his liturgy, 313; its defects, 314; his sermons, 315; his Mysticism, 316; his *Shepherd*, 320–323; parallel between him and Luther, 353–361; his share in the Eucharistic controversy, 364, 365; his treatise against Luther, 371; mediates in the Swiss Peasants' War; his marriage and family relations, 399; his friendship for Philip of Hesse, ii. 4; his disputes with the Anabaptists, 33; disputes with Hubmaier on baptism, 37; and with Eck, 41; refuses to attend Baden Disputation, 43; excommunicated by that body, 47; his firm attitude, 49; at Bern Disputation, 55; his sermons there, 55, 56; his military activity, 88; compared with Luther in this respect, 88–91; joins army of Zurich, 91, 92; dissatisfied with Peace of Steinhausen, 94; refrains from attacking Luther, 96; moderation of his treatise, 99; at last resorts to coarseness, 102; sets out for Marburg, 103; his conduct there, 105, 106; his communication to Charles v., 126–129; its reception, 129; his reply to Eck, 130; contrasted with Luther, 137–140; their substantial agreement, 140; at battle of Kappel, 164; his death, 165; savage treatment of his body, 166; review of his character, 167–172; limited extension of his Reformation, 351.

THE END.

ies is one of great importance to the biblical scholar; and as regards its ecution it leaves little or nothing to be desired.'—*Edinburgh Review.*

KEIL AND DELITZSCH'S
RODUCTION TO AND COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In 27 Volumes, demy 8vo.

MESSRS. CLARK have resolved to offer complete sets of this work at the Original Subscription Price of £7, 2s. 0d. Single volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.

Just published, in demy 4to, Second Edition, price 25s.,

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

By HERMANN CREMER, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GREIFSWALD.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF THE SECOND EDITION

(WITH ADDITIONAL MATTER AND CORRECTIONS BY THE AUTHOR)

By WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

'If the reader will search here for that which the Author professes to provide for him, he will, we think, never be disappointed. On the contrary, he will feel that Professor Cremer has placed him under deep obligation, and will have veins of rich and beautiful thought continually revealed.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'We venture to express our conviction that the student will derive from it information which he will in vain seek in any other work of the same description.'—*Christian Observer.*

Just published, in One large 8vo Volume, Eighth English Edition, price 15s.,

A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK,

Regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis.

Translated from the German of Dr. G. B. WINER.

With large additions and full Indices. Second Edition. Edited by Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D., one of the New Testament Translation Revisers.

'We gladly welcome the appearance of Winer's great work in an English translation, and must strongly recommend it to all who wish to attain to a sound and accurate knowledge of the language of the New Testament. We need not say it is *the* Grammar of the New Testament. It is not only superior to all others, but *so* superior as to be by common consent the one work of reference on the subject. No other could be mentioned with it.'—*Literary Churchman.*

Just published, in One Volume, 8vo, price 12s.,

Final Causes.

BY PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute, Paris.

Translated from the French by William Affleck, B.D.

CONTENTS.

PRELIMINARY CHAPTER—The Problem. BOOK I.—The Law of Finality. CHAPTER I. The Principle.—II. The Facts.—III. The Industry of Man and the Industry of Nature.—IV. Organ and Function.—V. Mechanism and Finality.—VI. Objections and Difficulties.—VII. The Doctrine of Evolution. BOOK II.—The First Cause of Finality. CHAPTER I. The Physico-Theological Argument.—II. Subjective and Immanent Finality.—III. Finality and Intention.—IV. Pure Idea and Creative Activity.—V. The Supreme End of Nature. APPENDIX.—I. The Problem of Induction.—II. Cuvier's Law.—III. Lesage, of Geneva, and Final Causes.—IV. Geoffroy Saint Hilaire and the Doctrine of Final Causes.—V. Final Causes in the Sankhya Philosophy.—VI. Optimism—Voltaire and Rousseau.

This work of Janet on the *Causes Finales* is really an event in science, and ought to have a large circulation among the educated classes.

In One Volume, 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

The Doctrine of the Apocalypse,

And its Relation to the Doctrine of the Gospel and Epistles of John.

BY HERMANN GEBHARDT.

'A contribution of decided value to the doctrinal and spiritual exposition of the mystic volume, and in this respect worthy of careful study.'—*Church Bells.*

'The Author has instituted and carried out a thorough and exhaustive examination of the Book of Revelation; . . . he has subjected the whole text of that highly symbolic, and, to ordinary readers, mysterious and incomprehensible book, to a minute and searching scrutiny.'—*Scotsman.*

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

Growth of the Spirit of Christianity,

FROM THE FIRST CENTURY TO THE DAWN OF THE LUTHERAN ERA.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., B.D.,

AUTHOR OF 'AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.'

'Mr. Matheson's work is fresh, vigorous, learned, and eminently thoughtful.'—*Contemporary Review.*

'This work is a contribution of real value to the popular study of Church History.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

'These volumes are the work of a very able and pious and cultured thinker.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

In crown 8vo, Third Edition, price 4s. 6d.,

Aids to the Study of German Theology.

'The Author has done his work well, and has given us a real help to the understanding of German theology.'—*Princeton Review.*

'A work of much labour and learning, giving in a small compass an intelligent review of a very large subject.'—*Spectator.*

'The writer or compiler deserves high praise for the clear manner in which he has in a brief compass stated these opinions.'—*Christian Observer.*

In crown 8vo, Eighth Edition, price 7s. 6d.,

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR:

OR, MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAYS OF THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

By F. W. KRUMMACHER, D.D.

'The work bears throughout the stamp of an enlightened intellect, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and of a profound study of the word of God.'—*Record.*

'The reflections are of a pointed and practical character, and are eminently calculated to inform the mind and improve the heart. To the devout and earnest Christian the volume will be a treasure indeed.'—*Wesleyan Times.*

'The work will be prized by experienced Christians throughout the world; and is destined, we trust, to as wide a circulation and as long a life as the gifted Author's "Elijah."'—*English Presbyterian Messenger.*

'Having already spoken of it in terms the most cordial and admiring, we have only to repeat our testimony to its peculiar excellence.'—*Church of England Magazine.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, Second Edition, in crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL:

A PORTRAIT DRAWN FROM BIBLE HISTORY AND THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

'Dr. Krummacher's work on David's life resembles that of his "Elijah" in its eloquence, its graphic description, its devout and earnest spirit, and will be widely welcomed.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

At the close of two articles reviewing this work, the *Christian Observer* says: 'Our space will not permit us to consider more at large this very interesting work, but we cannot do less than cordially commend it to the attention of our readers. It affords such an insight into King David's character as is nowhere else to be met with; it is therefore most instructive.'

'A pleasant household reading-book for many people.'—*Literary Churchman.*

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D.,
Author of 'A History of Christian Doctrine,' etc.

'These sermons are admirably suited to their purpose. Characterized by profound knowledge of divine truth, and presenting the truth in a chaste and attractive style, the sermons carry in their tone the accents of the solemn feeling of responsibility to which they owe their origin.'—*Weekly Review.*

In One Volume, crown 8vo, price 5s., Third Edition,

LIGHT FROM THE CROSS:

SERMONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD.

Translated from the German of A. THOLUCK, D.D.,

Professor of Theology in the University of Halle.

'With no ordinary confidence and pleasure, we commend these most noble, solemnizing, and touching discourses.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

In crown 8vo, price 5s.,

THE LEVITICAL PRIESTS.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITICISM OF TH PENTATEUCH.

By SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, Jr.,

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, LEIPZIG.

'A real contribution to the criticism of the Pentateuch, and a storehouse of arguments against that neological school which expends its confessedly great powers in splitting hairs and weaving sophistries, and which tries by arrogant assertion to compensate for weakness of proof.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'Dr. Curtiss has argued his thesis with conspicuous ability, candour, and learning.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 5s.,

THE SYMBOLIC PARABLES

OF

THE CHURCH, THE WORLD, AND THE ANTICHRIST:

Being the Separate Predictions of the Apocalypse,

VIEWED IN THEIR RELATION TO THE GENERAL TRUTHS OF SCRIPTURE.

By Mrs. STEVENSON.

'It is quite refreshing to meet with a treatise on the Book of Revelation like this, marked by good sense and reverence. Brief as it is, it throws more light on a difficult subject than many laboured tomes.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

'It deserves careful study from all by whom the Book of Revelation has been regarded as a mystic utterance not meant for them, for it has the great advantage of being comprehensible by the most simple and unlearned.'—*John Bull.*

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

By FRIEDRICH ADOLPH PHILIPPI.

Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 4s.,

OUTLINES OF BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By J. T. BECK, D.D.,

PROF. ORD. THEOL., TÜBINGEN.

Translated from the Third Enlarged and Corrected German Edition, 1877.

'The smallness of the work should not lead to its being undervalued; it well deserves a place side by side with Delitzsch and Heard. . . . We do warmly recommend this volume as one of the most fresh and valuable contributions to theological literature of recent date.'—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.*

'We quite endorse Bishop Ellicott's statement that, for many readers, Beck's will be found to be the most handy manual on the subject.'—*Church Bells.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 12s.,

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE,

Including Inquiries into the Origin of Sacrifice, the Jewish Ritual, the Atonement, and the Lord's Supper.

By ALFRED CAVE, B.A.

'We have nothing but praise for its clearness, its method, its thoroughness, and its tolerance. We most warmly commend Mr. Cave's book to the study of the clergy, who will find it full of suggestiveness and instruction.'—*English Churchman.*

'A thoroughly able and erudite book, from almost every page of which something may be learned. The Author's method is exact and logical, the style perspicuous and forcible—sometimes, indeed, almost epigrammatic; and as a careful attempt to ascertain the teaching of the Scripture on an important subject, it cannot fail to be interesting even to those whom it does not convince.'—*Watchman.*

In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS.

By IMMANUEL KANT.

Translated by J. W. SEMPLE, Advocate. Third Edition. Edited by H. CALDERWOOD, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh.

'A translation of Kant into intelligible English may be supposed to be as difficult as a translation of Carlyle into Ciceronian Latin. But Mr. Semple's translation has been accepted by scholars as a real success. Some real knowledge of Kant is indispensable in order to comprehension of the learned thought of our time, and because the study of Kant is, on the whole, the best preliminary discipline for independent study of philosophy proper as distinguished from mere science.'—*Contemporary Review.*

Recently published, in demy 8vo, Third Edition, price 7s. 6d.,

AN INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR;

With Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing.

By A. B. DAVIDSON, M.A., LL.D.,
Professor of Hebrew, etc., in the New College, Edinburgh.

'As a system of Hebrew Accidence, within the proper limits of the subject, the book is characterized by great completeness as well as simplicity. Ease has never been purchased at the expense of fulness, and in many cases matter is given which will be vainly sought for in the larger book of Rödiger. The paradigms are particularly full and good.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION

IN

GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND CHIEFLY.

By Dr. K. R. HAGENBACH.

Translated from the Fourth Revised Edition of the German.

DR. LUTHARDT'S WORKS.

In three handsome crown 8vo volumes, price 6s. each.

'We do not know any volumes so suitable in these times for young men entering on life, or, let us say, even for the library of a pastor called to deal with such, than the three volumes of this series. We commend the whole of them with the utmost cordial satisfaction. They are altogether quite a specialty in our literature.'—*Weekly Review.*

APOLOGETIC LECTURES
ON THE
FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Fourth Edition.

BY C. E. LUTHARDT, D.D., LEIPZIG.

'From Dr. Luthardt's exposition even the most learned theologians may derive invaluable criticism, and the most acute disputants supply themselves with more trenchant and polished weapons than they have as yet been possessed of.'—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

APOLOGETIC LECTURES
ON THE
SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Third Edition.

'Dr. Luthardt is a profound scholar, but a very simple teacher, and expresses himself on the gravest matters with the utmost simplicity, clearness, and force.'—*Literary World.*

APOLOGETIC LECTURES
ON THE
MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Second Edition.

'The ground covered by this work is, of course, of considerable extent, and there is scarcely any topic of specifically moral interest now under debate in which the reader will not find some suggestive saying. The volume contains, like its predecessors, a truly wealthy apparatus of notes and illustrations.'—*English Churchman.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR C. E. LUTHARDT,
Author of 'Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' etc.

Translated and the Literature enlarged by C. R. GREGORY, Leipzig.

'A work of thoroughness and value. The translator has added a lengthy Appendix, containing a very complete account of the literature bearing on the controversy respecting this Gospel. The indices which close the volume are well ordered, and add greatly to its value.'—*Guardian.*

'There are few works in the later theological literature which contain such a wealth of sober theological knowledge and such an invulnerable phalanx of objective apologetical criticism.'—*Professor Guericke.*

Crown 8vo, 5s.,

LUTHARDT, KAHNIS, AND BRÜCKNER.

The Church: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position.

'A comprehensive review of this sort, done by able hands, is both instructive and suggestive.'—*Record.*

WORKS BY THE LATE

PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

PASTORAL THEOLOGY: A Treatise on the Office and Duties of the Christian Pastor. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author.

'This treatise on the office and duties of a Christian pastor, by the late Professor Fairbairn, is well deserving thoughtful perusal. Throughout the volume, however, there is a tone of earnest piety and practical good sense, which finds expression in many profitable counsels, embodying the result of large experience and shrewd observation. . . . Much of the volume is devoted to the theory and practice of preaching, and this part we can most heartily commend; it is replete with valuable suggestions, which even those who have had some experience in the ministry will find calculated to make them more attractive and efficient preachers.'—*Christian Observer.*

In crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Greek Text and Trans- lation. With Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations.

'We cordially recommend this work to ministers and theological students.'—*Methodist Magazine.*

'We have read no book of his with a keener appreciation and enjoyment than that just published on the Pastoral Epistles.'—*Nonconformist.*

In two volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s., Sixth Edition,

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE, viewed in connection with the whole Series of the Divine Dispensations.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Fourth Edition,

EZEKIEL, AND THE BOOK OF HIS PROPHECY: An Exposition. With a new Translation.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Second Edition,

PROPHECY, viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and Proper Interpretation.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

HERMENEUTICAL MANUAL; or, Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE REVELATION OF LAW IN SCRIPTURE, considered with respect both to its own Nature and to its Relative Place in Successive Dispensations. (The Third Series of the 'Cunningham Lectures.')

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

SERMONS

FOR THE

CHRISTIAN YEAR.

ADVENT—TRINITY.

BY PROFESSOR ROTHE.

TRANSLATED BY WILLIAM R. CLARK, M.A. OXON.,
Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Taunton.

'The volume is rich in noble thoughts and wholesome lessons.'—*Watchman.*

'The sermons before us are wonderfully simple in construction and expression, and at the same time remarkably fresh and suggestive. . . . It is a mind of real keenness, singularly pure and gentle, and of lofty spirituality, that expresses itself in these discourses.'—*Weekly Review.*

Just published, in two vols., large crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d. each,

THE YEAR OF SALVATION.

WORDS OF LIFE FOR EVERY DAY.

A BOOK OF HOUSEHOLD DEVOTION.

BY J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.

'A work of great value and interest. To the clergy these readings will be found full of suggestive hints for sermons and lectures; while for family reading or for private meditation they are most excellent. The whole tone of the work is thoroughly practical, and never becomes controversial.'—*Church Bells.*

'The *very best* religious exposition for everyday use that has ever fallen in our way.'—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

'This charming and practical book of household devotion will be welcomed on account of its rare intrinsic value, as one of the most practical devotional books ever published.'—*Standard.*

'Massive of thought, persuasive, earnest, and eloquent.'—*Literary Churchman.*

As might have been expected from so clear and vigorous a thinker, every passage is valuable either as an exposition or a suggestion.'—HENRY WARD BEECHER in *Christian Union.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

MOSES:

A BIBLICAL STUDY.

Our author has seized, as with the instinct of a master, the great salient points in the life and work of Moses, and portrayed the various elements of his character with vividness and skill. . . . The work will at once take its place among our ablest and most valuable expository and practical discourses.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'A volume full of valuable and suggestive thought, which well deserves and will amply repay careful perusal. We have read it with real pleasure.'—*Christian Observer.*

In Three Volumes, 8*vo*, *price* 31*s.* 6*d.*,

A COMMENTARY
ON THE
GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.
BY F. GODET, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

'This work forms one of the battle-fields of modern inquiry, and is itself so rich in spiritual truth that it is impossible to examine it too closely; and we welcome this treatise from the pen of Dr. Godet. We have no more competent exegete, and this new volume shows all the learning and vivacity for which the author is distinguished.'—*Freeman.*

Just published, in Two Volumes, 8*vo*, *price* 21*s.*,

A COMMENTARY
ON THE
GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.
BY F. GODET,
DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

Translated from the Second French Edition.

'We are indebted to the Publishers for an English translation of the admirable work which stands at the head of this review. . . . It is a work of great ability, learning, and research.'—*Christian Observer.*

'Marked by clearness and good sense, it will be found to possess value and interest as one of the most recent and copious works specially designed to illustrate this Gospel.'—*Guardian.*

Just published, in demy 8*vo*, *Third Edition*, *price* 10*s.* 6*d.*,

MODERN DOUBT & CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth.

BY THEODORE CHRISTLIEB, D.D.,
UNIVERSITY PREACHER AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT BONN.

Translated, with the Author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT, Ph.D., and Edited by the Rev. T. L. KINGSBURY, M.A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean.

'We recommend the volume as one of the most valuable and important among recent contributions to our apologetic literature. . . . We are heartily thankful both to the learned Author and to his translators.'—*Guardian.*

'All the fundamental questions connected with revealed religion are handled more or less fully. The volume shows throughout intellectual force and earnestness.'—*Athenæum.*

'We express our unfeigned admiration of the ability displayed in this work, and of the spirit of deep piety which pervades it; and whilst we commend it to the careful perusal of our readers, we heartily rejoice that in those days of reproach and blasphemy, so able a champion has come forward to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.'—*Christian Observer.*

Recently published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

A CHRONOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

By C. E. CASPARI.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES, BY

M. J. EVANS, B.A.

Revised by the Author.

'The work is handy and well suited for the use of the student. It gives him, in very reasonable compass and in well-digested forms, a great deal of information respecting the dates and outward circumstances of our Lord's life, and materials for forming a judgment upon the various disputed points arising out of them.'—*Guardian.*

'An excellent and devout work. We can strongly recommend it.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

Recently published, in demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD

IN RELATION TO MODERN CRITICISM.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

F. L. STEINMEYER, D.D.,

Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

'This work vindicates in a vigorous and scholarly style the sound view of miracles against the sceptical assaults of the time.'—*Princeton Review.*

'We commend the study of this work to thoughtful and intelligent readers, and especially to students of divinity, whose position requires a competent knowledge of modern theological controversy.'—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.*

Just published, price 5s.,

MESSIANIC PROPHECY:

Its Origin, Historical Character, and Relation to New Testament Fulfilment.

By Dr. EDWARD RIEHM,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, HALLE.

Translated from the German, with the Approbation of the Author,

By the Rev. JOHN JEFFERSON.

'Undoubtedly original and suggestive, and deserving careful consideration.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'Its intrinsic excellence makes it a valuable contribution to our biblical literature.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

In demy 8vo, price 6s.,

THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

A Commentary, Grammatical and Critical, upon Isaiah lii. 13–liii. 12.

WITH DISSERTATIONS UPON THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH XL.-LXVI., AND UPON THE MEANING OF EBED JEHOVAH.

By WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.,

Of Trinity College, Dublin; *Tutor in* Hebrew, New College, London.

'This is a very able and seasonable contribution to biblical literature.'—*Watchman.*

'The commentary evinces the great ability, accurate and extensive scholarship, and admirable judgment of the Author.'—*Weekly Review.*

In 24 Volumes, demy 8vo, Subscription Price £4, 4s.,

WORKS OF DR. JOHN OWEN.

Edited by Rev. W. H. GOOLD, D.D., Edinburgh.

The COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, *in Seven Volumes, may be had separately, price 42s.*

Several years have now elapsed since the first publication of this edition of the Works of the greatest of Puritan Divines. Time has tested its merits, and it is now admitted on all hands to be the only correct and complete edition.

As there are above Fourteen Thousand Pages in all, each Volume therefore averages *Five Hundred and Ninety Pages.*

'You will find that in John Owen the learning of Lightfoot, the strength of Charnock, the analysis of Howe, the savour of Leighton, the raciness of Heywood, the glow of Baxter, the copiousness of Barrow, the splendour of Bates, are all combined. We should quickly restore the race of great divines if our candidates were disciplined in such lore.' —*The late* Dr. HAMILTON *of Leeds.*

WORKS OF JOHN CALVIN.

The Contents of the series are as follow:—

Institutes of the Christian Religion, 2 vols.
Tracts on the Reformation, 3 vols.
Commentary on Genesis, 2 vols.
Harmony of the last Four Books of the Pentateuch, 4 vols.
Commentary on Joshua, 1 vol.
" on the Psalms, 5 vols.
" on Isaiah, 4 vols.
" on Jeremiah and Lamentations, 5 vols.
" on Ezekiel, 2 vols.
" on Daniel, 2 vols.
" on Hosea, 1 vol.
" on Joel, Amos, and Obadiah, 1 vol.
" on Jonah, Micah, and Nahum, 1 vol.
" on Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Haggai, 1 vol.
Commentary on Zechariah and Malachi, 1 vol.
Harmony of the Synoptical Evangelists, 3 vols.
Commentary on John's Gospel, 2 vols.
" on Acts of the Apostles, 2 vols.
" on Romans, 1 vol.
" on Corinthians, 2 vols.
" on Galatians and Ephesians, 1 vol.
" on Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians, 1 vol.
" on Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, 1 vol.
" on Hebrews, 1 vol.
" on Peter, John, James, and Jude, 1 vol.

A *Selection* of Six Volumes (or more at the same proportion) for 21s., with the exception of the INSTITUTES, 2 vols.; PSALMS, vols. 1 and 5; and HABAKKUK.

The LETTERS, edited by Dr. BONNET, 2 vols., 10s. 6d.

Any Separate Volume (with the above exceptions), 6s.

The INSTITUTES, 2 vols., translated, 14s.

" " in Latin, Tholuck's edition, 2 vols., (*subscription price*) 14s.

RITTER'S GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE.

IN FOUR VOLUMES 8VO, PRICE 32s.

THE COMPARATIVE GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE AND THE SINAITIC PENINSULA. By Professor CARL RITTER of Berlin. Translated and adapted for the use of Biblical Students by WILLIAM L. GAGE.

'I have always looked on Ritter's *Comparative Geography of Palestine*, comprised in his famous "Erdkunde," *as the great classical work on the subject*—a clear and full *resumé* of all that was known of Bible lands up to the time he wrote, and as such indispensable to the student of Bible Geography and History. This translation will open up a flood of knowledge to the English reader, especially as the editor is a man thoroughly imbued with the spirit of this noble-minded and truly Christian Author.'—KEITH JOHNSTON, Esq., *Geographer in Ordinary to Her Majesty for Scotland.*

'One of the most valuable works on Palestine ever published.'—Rev. H. B. TRISTRAM, *Author of 'The Land of Israel.'*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

HIPPOLYTUS AND CALLISTUS;

OR,

THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

BY J. J. IGN. VON DÖLLINGER.

Translated, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices,

BY ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A.,

MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

'That this learned and laborious work is a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, is a fact of which we need hardly assure our readers. The name of the writer is a sufficient guarantee of this. It bears in all its pages the mark of that acuteness which, even more than the unwearied industry of its venerated Author, is a distinguishing feature of whatever proceeds from the pen of Dr. Döllinger.'—*John Bull.*

Just published, in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 12s. each,

A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH TO A.D. 429.

From the Original Documents.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

C. J. HEFELE, D.D., BISHOP OF ROTTENBURG.

'This careful translation of Hefele's Councils.'—Dr. PUSEY.

'A thorough and fair compendium, put in the most accessible and intelligent form.'—*Guardian.*

'A work of profound erudition, and written in a most candid spirit. The book will be a standard work on the subject.'—*Spectator.*

'The most learned historian of the Councils.'—Père GRATRY.

'We cordially commend Hefele's Councils to the English student.'—*John Bull.*

In demy 8vo, 700 pages, price 12s.,

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON THE

BOOK OF PSALMS.

WITH A NEW TRANSLATION.

BY JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., T.C.D.,

AUTHOR OF COMMENTARIES ON THE BOOKS OF GENESIS, EXODUS, ETC.

'This work aims, and not unsuccessfully, at bringing out the sense and elucidating the principle of each psalm. The notes are plain and to the purpose. It has plenty of matter, and is not diffuse.'—*Guardian.*

'Dr. Murphy's contribution to the literature of the Psalms is a most welcome addition. . . . We have no hesitation in predicting for it a cordial reception from all who can appreciate a sound and scholarly exegesis, and who are anxious to discover the full and exact meaning of the inspired word.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

(TEMPORARY) CHEAP RE-ISSUE OF

STIER'S WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS.

To meet a very general desire that this now well-known Work should be brought more within the reach of all classes, both Clergy and Laity, Messrs. CLARK are now issuing, for a limited period, the *Eight* Volumes, handsomely bound in *Four*, at the *Subscription price* of

TWO GUINEAS.

As the allowance to the Trade must necessarily be small, orders sent either direct or through booksellers must *in every case* be accompanied with a Post Office Order for the above amount.

'The whole work is a treasury of thoughtful exposition. Its measure of practical and spiritual application, with exegetical criticism, commends it to the use of those whose duty it is to preach as well as to understand the Gospel of Christ.'—*Guardian.*

New and Cheap Edition, in Four Vols. Demy 8vo, *Subscription price* 28s.

THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A Complete Critical Examination of the Origin, Contents, and Connection of the Gospels. Translated from the German of J. P. LANGE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Bonn. Edited, with additional Notes, by MARCUS DODS, D.D.

'We have arrived at a most favourable conclusion regarding the importance and ability of this work—the former depending upon the present condition of theological criticism, the latter on the wide range of the work itself; the singularly dispassionate judgment of the author, as well as his pious, reverential, and erudite treatment of a subject inexpressibly holy. . . . We have great pleasure in recommending this work to our readers. We are convinced of its value and enormous range.'—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

BENGEL'S GNOMON—CHEAP EDITION.

GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By JOHN ALBERT BENGEL. Now First Translated into English. With Original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Edited by the Rev. ANDREW R. FAUSSET, M.A. The Original Translation was in Five Large Volumes, demy 8vo, averaging more than 550 pages each, and the very great demand for this edition has induced the Publishers to issue the *Five* Volumes bound in *Three*, at the *Subscription price* of

TWENTY-FOUR SHILLINGS.

They trust by this still further to increase its usefulness.

'It is a work which manifests the most intimate and profound knowledge of Scripture, and which, if we examine it with care, will often be found to condense more matter into a line than can be extracted from many pages of other writers.'—Archdeacon HARE.

'In respect both of its contents and its tone, Bengel's Gnomon stands alone. Even among laymen there has arisen a healthy and vigorous desire for scriptural knowledge, and Bengel has done more than any other man to aid such inquirers. There is perhaps no book every word of which has been so well weighed, or in which a single technical term contains so often far-reaching and suggestive views. . . . The theoretical and practical are as intimately connected as light and heat in the sun's ray.'—*Life of Perthes.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 0s.,

A TREATISE ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

By CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE NORTH-WEST, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

'It will be seen from this abbreviated account of the contents that scarcely anything is omitted to make the volume complete as a book of reference on the general subject.'—*Rock.*

'The style is clear, direct, vigorous; and the whole treatise is all that ordinary readers can need, either for the establishment of their own faith or defence against attacks from without.'—*Watchman.*

'A book of true worth, on a topic which is the real battle-ground of controversy, furnishing to readers clear arguments, magnificent facts, and a weight of authority for an intelligent faith in the sacred Scriptures.'—*Homiletic Quarterly.*

In Two Vols., demy 8vo, price 21s.,

HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY,

PARTICULARLY IN GERMANY,

Viewed according to its Fundamental Movement, and in connection with the Religious, Moral, and Intellectual Life.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. J. A. DORNER, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, BERLIN.

With a Preface to the Translation by the Author.

'Dr. Dorner is distinguished by massive breadth of thought . . . by scholarly research, genial appreciation of all forms of culture, and a well-balanced judgment, swayed by a spirit of fairness to those who differ from him. . . . The work is in every way deserving of careful examination now, as it is likely to be afterwards valued as one deserving the highest confidence as a book of reference, on account of its ample research among the materials on which competent judgment must rest. . . . We regard with satisfaction the appearance of such a work. The highest interests are promoted by a treatise at once scholarly and eminently suggestive, which deals with theology at once scientifically and historically.'—*Contemporary Review.*

'This masterly work of Dr. Dorner, so successfully rendered into English by the present translators, will more than sustain the reputation he has already achieved by his exhaustive and, as it seems to us, conclusive *History of the Development of Doctrine respecting the Person of Christ.*'—*Spectator.*

In demy 8vo, price 12s.,

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

By PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.,

Author of a 'Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.'

'Those acquainted with the Author's previous works will be prepared for something valuable in his present work; and it will not disappoint expectation, but rather exceed it. The most recent literature of his subject is before him, and he handles it with care and skill. . . . It will be found a trustworthy guide, and raises the Author's reputation in this important branch of biblical study.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

'A work of uncommon merit. He must be a singularly accomplished [illegible] library this book is not a welcome and valuable addition.'—*Athenæum.*

In Eleven Volumes, demy 8vo, 12s. each,

THE COLLECTED WORKS
OF
DUGALD STEWART, Esq., F.R.S.S.,

PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

EDITED BY SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON, BART.

CONTENTS.

VOL. I.—Dissertation. VOLS. II., III., and IV.—Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind. VOL. V.—Philosophical Essays. VOLS. VI. and VII.—Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man. VOLS. VIII. and IX.—Lectures on Political Economy. VOL. X.—Biographical Memoirs of Adam Smith, LL.D., William Robertson, D.D., and Thomas Reid, D.D.; to which is prefixed a Memoir of Dugald Stewart, with Selections from his Correspondence, by John Veitch, M.A., Professor of Logic and Rhetoric, Glasgow University. VOL. XI.—Translations of the Passages in Foreign Languages contained in the Collected Works; with General Index.

'This edition is one of great and permanent value. It has the incalculable advantage of being superintended by a man of greater genius than the Author, and hence it possesses a double interest to the philosophical reader.'—*Church of England Quarterly Review.*

'Altogether the style of this edition leaves nothing to be desired. A more illustrious monument to the memory of a great man could not be raised, and the admirers of Mr. Stewart's genius, and indeed all the disciples of mental philosophy, must feel greatly indebted to Sir William Hamilton for the worthy service he is performing.'—*Eclectic Review.*

'This edition, with notes by Sir William Hamilton, is incomparably the best that has been published, and ought to find its way into every good library.'—*Christian Observer.*

Recently published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

DELIVERY AND DEVELOPMENT
OF
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures.

BY ROBERT RAINY, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL OF AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND CHURCH HISTORY IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

'We gladly acknowledge their high excellence and the extensive learning which they display. They are *able* to the last degree; and the Author has in an unusual measure the power of acute and brilliant generalization. He handles his array of multifarious facts with ease and elegance; and we must needs acknowledge (and we do it willingly) that the Lectures are a real contribution to the settlement of the vast and obscure question with which they are occupied.'—*Literary Churchman.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 12s.,

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY,

With a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ.

By G. B. FISHER, D.D.

'The work throughout indicates extensive and impartial research. Dr. Fisher is a fresh and vigorous thinker—a man of ripe scholarship and fine spiritual intuition.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 12s.,

FAITH AND PHILOSOPHY:
DISCOURSES AND ESSAYS.

By H. B. SMITH, D.D.

'There is not one of these Essays but is at once able and interesting.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

Just published, Second Edition, demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.,

The Training of the Twelve;

OR,

EXPOSITION OF PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS EXHIBITING THE TWELVE DISCIPLES OF JESUS UNDER DISCIPLINE FOR THE APOSTLESHIP.

BY

A. B. BRUCE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

'Here we have a really great book on an important, large, and attractive subject—a book full of loving, wholesome, profound thoughts about the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

'It is some five or six years since this work first made its appearance, and now that a second edition has been called for, the Author has taken this opportunity to make some alterations which are likely to render it still more acceptable. Substantially, however, the book remains the same, and the hearty commendation with which we noted its first issue applies to it at least as much now.'—*Rock.*

'The value, the beauty of this volume is that it is a unique contribution to, because a loving and cultured study of, the life of Christ, in the relation of the Master of the Twelve.'—*Edinburgh Daily Review.*

'The volume is of permanent value, and we trust that its Author may favour us with others of like character.'—*Freeman.*

'It is of no mean order as a profoundly devout piece of practical divinity.'—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.*

'It was by the first edition of this invaluable book that Dr. Bruce became known to English students as a theological writer. A more scholarly, more helpful book has not been published for many years past.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In One Volume, 8vo, price 12s.,

The Humiliation of Christ

IN ITS PHYSICAL, ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS

(Sixth Series of Cunningham Lectures.)

'These lectures are able and deep-reaching to a degree not often found in the religious literature of the day; withal, they are fresh and suggestive. . . . The learning and the deep and sweet spirituality of this discussion will commend it to many faithful students of the truth as it is in Jesus.'—*Congregationalist.*

'We have not for a long time met with a work so fresh and suggestive as this of Professor Bruce. . . . We do not know where to look at our English Universities for a treatise so calm, logical, and scholarly.'—*English Independent.*

'The title of the book gives but a faint conception of the value and wealth of its contents. . . . Dr. Bruce's work is really one of exceptional value; and no one can read it without perceptible gain in theological knowledge.'—*English Churchman.*

'The writer gives evidence of extensive and accurate theological learning in the topics of which he treats, and he shows that he has theological grasp as well as learning.'—*Church Bells.*

00111687

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018